COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA

25

POLITICAL THESIS

ADOPTED AT THE SECOND CONGRESS
FEB. 28 - MARCH 6, 1948, CALCUTTA

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

POLITICAL THESIS of the Communist Party of India

PASSED BY THE
SECOND CONGRESS AT CALCUTTA
FEB. 28—*MARCH* 6, 1948

Re. 1

First printed July 1948

Printed by Jayant Bhatt, at the New Age Printing Press, 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4, and published by V. M. Kaul for the Communist Party of India, Raj Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

CONTENTS

I. The International Situation .. 1

Role of right-wing Social Democrats .. 3

New class alignments .. 5

Imperialism's way out .. 7

In the colonies .. 10

Fiasco of imperialist policy .. 11

II. Changes in India during World War II and Economic Basis of Collaborationist Policy of Bourgeoisie .. 14

Basis of revolutionary wave .. 16

Workers and the war crisis .. 18

Economic basis of collaboration .. 21

Imperialism needs collaboration .. 30

III. Post-war Revolutionary Upsurge and New Policies of Imperialism and Indian Bourgeoisie—New Class Alignment .. 32

Real face of Mountbatten Award .. 38

National Government and the people .. 41

Government's economic policy .. 45

Government's foreign policy .. 46
New role of the bourgeoisie .. 48
Game behind the riot offensive .. 49
Unmask the compromisers and communalists 53
Patel and Nehru .. 54
National leaders and the masses .. 55

IV. DEEPENING ECONOMIC CRISIS IN INDIA....THE CAPITALIST AND THE PEOPLE'S WAYS OUT .. 57
Collapse of agrarian economy .. 58
Industry and war .. 61

V. AGAINST IMPERIALIST-BOURGEOIS CONSPIRACY FORGE A NEW CLASS ALLIANCE... PROGRAMME OF DEMOCRATIC FRONT .. 73
Masses fight back .. 73
New class alliance .. 74
United front with Left parties .. 77
Congress, League and Democratic Front .. 78
The Socialist Party .. 79
Programme of democratic revolution .. 84

VI. TASKS OF THE PARTY IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION .. 88
Tasks on the trade union front .. 88
Tasks on the peasant front .. 97

Tasks on the student front .. 100
Tasks among the youth .. 102
Tasks on the women's front .. 103
Tasks on the States' people's front .. 105
The Untouchables .. 110
The minorities .. 112
The war danger .. 113
Fight for self-determination .. 114
Foreign policy .. 114
Lead the masses .. 116

46 Tasks on the student front .. 100

48 Tasks among the youth .. 102

49 Tasks on the workers' front .. 103

53 Tasks on the States' people's front .. 105

54 The Untouchables .. 110

55 The minorities .. 112

The war danger .. 113

Fight for self-determination .. 114

Foreign policy .. 116

Lead the masses .. 118

IV. Deepening Economic Crisis in India ... The Capitalist and the People's Wants Out ... 57

Origin of agrarian economy .. 58

Industry and war .. 61

V. Against Imperialist-Bourgeois Conspiracy Forge A New Class Alliance ... Programme of Democratic Front .. 73

Masses fight back .. 73

New class alliance .. 74

United front with Left parties .. 77

Congress, League and Democratic Front .. 78

The Socialist Party .. 79

Programme of democratic revolution .. 84

VI. Tasks of the Party in the Struggle for People's Democratic Revolution .. 88

Tasks on the trade union front .. 88

Tasks on the peasant front .. 97

1. THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE defeat of Hitler Germany and Fascist Japan in World War II has completely altered the international landscape and moved the balance decisively in favour of the working class and its revolutionary movement. Though the elimination of powerful rivals like Germany and Japan might appear to have strengthened other imperialist powers, yet the total result is not the strengthening of the world-imperialist system but its immense weakening; not the strengthening of American imperialism but its tremendous weakening before the world-revolutionary movement; not the strengthening of the capitalist world but the strengthening of the Socialist world and of the movements and people heading towards Socialism and national emancipation.

These results are to be seen in the direct increase in the power and strength of the revolutionary forces.

The imperialist expectation of a tremendous weakening of the Soviet Union, its economic collapse and chaos after the war has not only not materialised, but the contrary has come to be true.

In spite of the tremendous slaughter of manpower and the most devastating destruction of resources, the Soviet Union has come out stronger—an object of admiration for the people and a great rallying point for the working class and the masses in the struggle against capital. The might of its arms creates confidence among the masses of all countries and shatters the myth of the invincibility of imperialist arms.

Not only the military, but also the economic, organisational and industrial prestige of the Soviet Union has increased tremendously, and the people in capitalist countries contrast the planned, organised life in the Soviet Union with the anarchy in capitalist society.

Secondly, the rise in Eastern Europe of People's Democracies—where power belongs to the people, where large-scale industry, transport and the banks are owned by the State and where a bloc of the labouring classes of the population headed by the working class constitutes the leading force—is another big blow to world capitalism. It takes away a population equal in number to that of Britain and France put together and a big territory from the orbit of capitalism, and puts it firmly on the path to Socialism.

By tearing these countries out of the orbit of the imperialist-capitalist world, by establishing People's Democracies in them, which shatter the political and economic power of the exploiting classes, by organising States which embody the sovereignty of the people based on the alliance of workers, peasants and oppressed middle classes, and by strengthening the world Socialist sector, the Eastern European Democracies further widen the breach created by the Russian Revolution in 1917.

The strengthening of the revolutionary movement of the working class and the weakening of capitalism is further seen on the European continent in the immense rise in the strength of the Communist Parties—the vanguard of the working class—and in the growing unification of the class around them. The rise of the Italian and French Communist Parties, apart from those in Eastern Europe, was the logical conclusion of the great role they played in the revolutionary struggle against Fascism.

A measure of this immense strength is to be obtained not only by the immense growth in Party membership, but in the growth of the mass organisations led by the Parties; in the parliamentary successes scored—with the Communist Parties often coming out as the biggest single parties.

The rise of the Communist Parties in these countries epitomises the strength of the working class and the instability of the present regimes and the maturity of the revolutionary developments. It shows that before the parties of the Right can restore the pre-war capitalist balance, economically and politically, before

the ruling class can successfully throw the burdens of the crisis on the working class, it will have to wage big battles against the workers—battles in which the working-class strength is immense and great. It shows that the working class is in a position to defeat the new offensive and solve the revolutionary tasks of the present period.

Europe for the capitalists is on the brink of a disaster. In Britain, it is the Labour Government that stands between the mounting discontent and the capitalist rule. In America, which is getting more and more in the mire of the crisis, which is hungrily searching for markets all over the world and is attacking the living standard of its own people and the freedom of other nations—the crisis opens new battles between the financial autocrats and the common people.

The successful struggle for Chinese liberation that is being waged under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party strikes another powerful blow at the world imperialist order, threatening to alter the political landscape of Asia and preparing the way of throwing the imperialists and their agents out of the colonies. The growing rout of Chiang Kai-shek's armies and the fiasco of the policy of American imperialism unmistakably show that the imperialist policies and aims come up everywhere against insuperable obstacles in the shape of people struggling for freedom.

The Role of Right-Wing Social Democrats

In this new and decisive period of revolutionary developments, the right-wing Social Democrats, the traditional hangers-on of the bourgeoisie, come forward with their usual treacherous role as the lackeys and servitors of the bourgeoisie.

In the period of the anti-Fascist war, the Social Democratic leaders of France, Britain, etc., found themselves in the people's camp, along with their capitalist masters, who were compelled to join it. They joined it after they had slandered the Soviet Union, supported the Munichites, disrupted the Popular Front, split the ranks of the working class and had seen

the utter fiasco of the foreign policy of their masters.

In the course of the war, the Social Democratic leaders sabotaged the revolutionary armed liberation struggles against the Fascists, joining their imperialist masters, firstly, in relying on the Anglo-American invading armies and, secondly, in supporting the old reactionary imperialist agents (Badoglio, Mihailovitch, Mikolajzcyk, etc.) as against the people's liberation movements. Thus they acted as a brake on the initiative of the masses.

Today when in each country the question of fight against capitalist rule is being decisively posed, the right-wing Social Democrats, as true reformists, come out in favour of the capitalist order, as its defenders and apologists, as a hypocritical "third force" directing its fire on the working class and the Communist Party.

In the post-war elections, they capitalised the discontent of the masses against the traditional bourgeois parties, and secured majorities in parliaments (Britain); they capitalised the prestige which the participation of their ranks in the anti-Fascist struggle had won for them to get into Governments, and split the ranks of the working class.

The Social Democratic leaders, in conformity with the needs of their capitalist masters, follow a policy of attacking the living standards of the working class, of throwing the burdens of the crisis on the workers, of engaging in a mad hunt for markets, suppress the working class and the people, attack democratic rights, pursue an anti-Soviet, anti-Socialist and anti–revolutionary policy — a policy of defending the capitalist order and taking the people to another war.

The right-wing Social Democratic leaders have also emerged as the initiators of plans of bestial suppression, of full-scale wars against subject peoples in revolt at the end of the war. They have combined their military suppression with new forms of imperialist enslavement of subject peoples in alliance with native bourgeois classes, miscalled "independence." The British Labour Government has granted such fake "independence" to India, Pakistan, Burma, etc.

The Socialist Government of France, in defence of the French Empire, is suppressing with armed forces the Vietnamese people's struggle for freedom. The Dutch Socialists are fully supporting Dutch imperialism's colonial war in Indonesia.

The right-wing Social Democratic leaders, under the dictates of American imperialism, conspire with the reactionaries in throwing Communist Parties out of Government, in forming stop-gap coalitions with bourgeois parties to open the way to reactionary regimes, throw themselves on the mercy of American money and loans to maintain the present order and lend their influence to combat the growing wave of revolutionary discontent. Anti-Sovietism, anti-Communism, defence of capitalism, become the keys to understand the policies of the Social Democratic leadership.

New Class Alignments

The close of the anti-Fascist war has thus led to a new constellation of class forces. The old combination, in which certain sections of the bourgeoisie and their reformist hangers-on were found in the people's camp in the common battle against Fascism, is replaced by one in which the entire world bourgeoisie, ranged together with its reformist hangers-on and reactionary supporters, is attempting to blend itself together to stem the tide of revolution and oppose the working class, the people, the Socialist Soviet Union, the Eastern Democracies and the colonial peoples.

The impact of economic crisis and the imminent menace of revolution are the basic reasons why the new set-up comes into existence and the bourgeois States begin to conspire against the Soviet Union; why Anglo-American imperialism more and more uses its majority in U.N.O. as a bloc against the democratic nations.

Even during the course of the people's war, the contradiction between the Socialist and the capitalist worlds was developing (delay of the Second Front, Anglo-American intrigue to bleed the Soviet Union and support for reactionaries like Darlan, de Gaulle, Bado-

glio, etc.). After the end of the war and the sudden release of the economic crisis, the contradiction sharpened immensely.

The basic line of the bourgeois parties in each country, and of their reformist hangers-on, is to fight the revolution at home and abroad. That is why the old set-up completely changes. This is what creates two camps—the imperialist anti-democratic camp, and the anti-imperialist democratic camp composed of the Soviet Union, the Eastern European Democracies and the fighting people all over the world.

The leadership of the imperialist camp is in the hands of American imperialism whose strength has immensely grown in relation to its old rivals. It has out-distanced Britain to such an extent that Britain is a supplicant for alms at the American door. It has gained the most from the elimination of its most powerful rivals, Germany and Japan; this has whetted its appetite for markets. With its territory far from the field of war, it was able to develop its resources quickly in the war period, with the result that today its productive capacity has grown immensely.

With it have grown the lust and need for markets, for domination of colonies so that new fields of investment are opened and strategic war bases are secured, for subordinating every Government, whether of a colonial or advanced capitalist country, to stave off the crisis in America.

The rise of the American colossus overriding all other capitalist countries, subordinating nation after nation to its financial rule and operating as the most important factor in determining the policies of the capitalist world, is one of the basic elements in the new situation.

The maintenance and expansion of American imperialism can be achieved only by crushing the freedom and independence of all countries and by establishing Fascist reactionary dictatorships all over the world. The necessity of maintaining the old order has forced American imperialism to come out as the open enemy of all mankind.

The role of classes, political parties, leaders and

organisations, therefore, must be judged in relation to this basic role of American imperialism.

Simultaneously with this, there has been a flare up in the inter-imperialist antagonisms. The elimination of Japan and Germany has not solved but intensified the rivalry between Britain and America, and the two come into conflict in almost every part of the world: in the Middle East for oil; in South East Asia and French Indo-China; in Europe, the American dollar more and more forces back the British sterling. American imperialism even holds back British Big Business' own plans for rebuilding British industry, badly shattered during the war (for instance shipbuilding), exacting harsh terms in return for its loans; it is by using this whip-hand that it continuously applies its pressure to bring Britain firmly within its imperialist orbit, reducing it to the status of a second-rate power and its own satellite.

Today, with Britain dependent on America, the rival claims are being adjusted in favour of America—America forcing Britain to pull down or reduce import tariff walls, give wider scope to American trade, accept all kinds of conditions on loans and make Britain's colonies dependent on America. Britain has no choice as long as she continues to remain a capitalist country, and she is forced to trail behind America.

But a solution of the rival claims in this way only worsens the conditions of the British masses and hampers economic development. This will lead to growing consciousness and determination of the British working class to fight the Anglo-American reactionary alliance. Thus the basis of Anglo-American cooperation against the Soviet Union, against democratic revolution, gets weakened by the experience of the masses.

Imperialism's Way Out

Faced with the biggest revolutionary wave menacing its very existence, with the utter collapse of the capitalist order in Europe, with new gains scored by the working class and the people against monopoly capital

and with the threatened collapse of capitalist production in America—American imperialism seeks to find a way out of the present crisis in the interests of the capitalist order.

It pushes ahead with its Marshall Plan which is essentially directed to build the Western Bloc, a bloc of reactionary capitalist States in Western Europe, bound hand and foot to American imperialism, a reactionary bloc in which the restored industrial belt in Western Germany, controlled by American monopolies, acting directly and through the still-surviving Fascists, will occupy a central position.

The granting of American credits is directed to succour Europe's collapsing capitalist order and stave off the revolution, while in return these countries are forced to sell their economic and political independence to American imperialism, offering themselves as outlets for surplus American goods, thus turning themselves increasingly into virtual colonies of the U.S.A.

The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan based on it serve the needs of American expansion.

Economically, the Marshall Plan is a plan of rendering economic assistance by means of American credits to reactionary regimes in Europe. This economic "assistance" helps American imperialism to find a market for its goods in the country to which such assistance is rendered. American imperialism thus seeks to mitigate the crisis of over-production in America.

Politically, it is an attempt to bolster up anti-democratic reactionary Governments which, relying on reactionary vested interests, can act as stooges of American imperialism and sell the economic and political independence of their countries to American imperialism. American "assistance" generally means the domination of the political life of the country by American imperialism; sooner or later only those parties remain in power as are prepared to accept the dictates of Washington in their home and foreign policies and crush the democratic and working masses of their own countries.

American imperialism relies on the right-wing

Social Democrats of certain countries for help, since the parties of the Right are already discredited. It relies on the anti-Communism, anti-Sovietism, and the anti-revolutionary policy of the right-wing Social Democrats to do its job. Financial measures and immediate relief given by the U.S.A. supply a base for the treachery of the right-wing Social Democrats. They arm them with a weapon to cheat the masses and to parade before them the necessity of American aid by taking advantage of their starvation and loss of jobs.

The right-wing leaders of reformist parties today are used as the first weapon to split the ranks of the working class and begin the process of setting a country on the road to Fascism.

Simultaneously with this, American imperialism goes on arming and strengthening the real Fascists like de Gaulle.

It is on the basis of this aid to the collapsing capitalist structure that the American imperialists attempt to draw the right-wing Social Democrats and the bourgeois parties into a common front against the Soviet Union, into a Western Bloc to fight the Soviet Union and Eastern Democracies. The rebuilding of capitalist Fascist Germany, and the formation of the Western Bloc to unleash war and to fight the Soviet Union are integral parts of the imperialist plan to solve the crisis at the expense of the people. The war propaganda now being carried on, the atom bomb threat repeatedly given, and the anti-Soviet slander which has become a part of the bourgeois offensive—all show that imperialism seeks a way out through war, if it can do so.

To achieve this end, the unleashing of a Third World War, however, is not easy; for the Marshall Plan and its political counterpart, the plan to build a Western Bloc, can only succeed through destroying the independence and national sovereignty of the countries of Western Europe, transforming them into America's colonies; these plans are, therefore, bound to meet and are already meeting with the growing resistance of the democratic forces of Europe, headed by the Communist Parties and the working class, whose strength can certainly defeat the provocateurs of war.

The Marshall Plan is thus imperialism's way out of the crisis, a plan for the enslavement of the world and the colonial fascisation of Europe.

In The Colonies

The post-war revolutionary epoch has brought the colonies to the path of armed struggle against the imperialists and their allies. So powerful are these struggles and so great their revolutionary sweep that the achievement at one stroke of People's Democracy (as in the countries of Eastern Europe) becomes an immediate attainable objective. The imperialists and their bourgeois collaborators are overthrown and power passes into the hands of the toiling people led by the working class, which assures not only complete national independence but also the liquidation of the capitalist social order and the building of Socialism.

As in the metropolitan countries, so in the colonies, the old imperialist order — the colonial order — was collapsing. Ground down by exploitation and poverty —first by the imperialists and then by the Fascists— the people in many countries resisted the imperialists' attempt to come back after Japan's defeat, and fought with arms. Viet Nam and Indonesia carried on regular wars of liberation. Burma fought with weapons. India began to see armed struggles, mutinies and fraternisation of the army and the police with the people.

In the centre of this great struggle for colonial liberation stands the glorious fight of the Chinese people, led by the Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army, delivering massive blows against the main bulwark of colonial rule in Asia and the world. People's victory in the Chinese struggle will change the entire shape of Asia and the world, and ensure the doom of the colonial and the capitalist order.

Faced with this onrushing tide of revolution, imperialism makes desperate attempts to save the colonial order by seeking new allies with influence and with a mass-base, by cheating the colonial people with fake freedom and independence.

In China, American imperialism openly finances

the murderous campaign of Chiang Kai-shek—and yet, aware of the fact that the Kuomintang was discredited, makes an attempt to draw other parties into the fight against the Communists. But it places its main reliance on the Kuomintang and the armed help given to it.

In Indonesia, it sought to capitalise the vacillations of the bourgeoisie to temporise, defeat and betray the armed struggle of the people.

On the continent of Europe the imperialists first rely on the right-wing Social Democrats and then on other parties of the Right to achieve their objective. Everywhere their strategic aim is to secure a mass base for their offensive against revolution.

Fiasco of Imperialist Policy

The essence of recent international developments, however, is the growing frustration of imperialist designs, the growing isolation of Anglo-American imperialism and its henchmen in country after country, both in Europe and Asia.

The Conference of the Nine European Communist Parties in Poland in September 1947 and its decision to establish an Information Bureau for exchange of information and coordination of activities based on mutual agreement, marked a historic turning point in the development of the struggle between the democratic camp and the imperialist camp.

The militant call of the Conference to unite to resist the expansionist policy of American imperialism and its agents in every country and its drive to war, has led to a new upsurge of the democratic masses throughout the world who have increasingly gone over to the offensive against the Anglo-American imperialists and their local allies.

The firm refusal of the Central and Eastern European People's Democracies to support the Marshall Plan has dealt a heavy blow to American economic expansion. Subsequent developments in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, as well as in Rumania and Bulgaria, signify the utter isolation of reaction in these coun-

tries. The fact that the toiling masses ranged behind the Socialist and peasant parties in these countries have firmly expelled traitorous elements and adhered to the democratic blocs, and thus defeated the American conspiracy to foment civil war in these countries, underlines the tremendous isolation of the forces of imperialism and reaction, and the enormous strength of the democratic and popular forces.

In Greece, the heroic Democratic Army, commanded by General Markos, has liberated seven-tenths of Greek territory, while all American imperialism's attempts to crush it have been fought back determinedly; at the same time, America's agents, the Greek Fascists, are thoroughly isolated from the toiling people and face a growing opposition even in the territory they yet control, as reflected in numerous strikes and demonstrations.

The heroic struggle of the French working class in defence of the working-class interests and the sovereignty of French people has given another big blow to American plan of imperialist expansion.

So also in Italy, the growing strength of the People's Democratic Front, based on Communist-Socialist unity, evidenced in the successful mass struggles waged by different sections of the workers and agricultural labourers, reflect the increasing people's opposition to the American conspiracy to turn Italy with the aid of de Gasperi and local reaction into its Mediterranean colony.

A similar process is revealed in the growing disintegration of the mass following of the Kuomintang in China, the mounting workers', students' and people's upsurge against U.S.-Kuomintang dictatorship, contrasted with the ever-larger rally of the exploited masses around the banner of the Chinese Communist Party, inflicting on the Kuomintang militarists one defeat after another.

Despite the serious diversion created by the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine, the revolutionary anti-British demonstrations by the students and workers of Cairo, the successful students' and people's revolt in Iraq which led to the downfall of the puppet Govern-

ment and the rescinding of the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of slavery, the persistence of revolutionary discontent in Iran, necessitating martial law in Azerbaijan—all go to underline the immense revolutionary possibilities of the situation in the Middle East.

Therefore the chief danger before the working class today is to underestimate its own strength, the strength of the anti-imperialist camp of democracy and Socialism, and to overestimate the strength of the enemy camp, the camp of imperialism and reaction and its puppets and collaborators in each country.

The developments show that the people's revolutionary forces of the world are stronger than imperialist reaction and that reaction thrives only to the extent it can disrupt and blackmail the democratic camp with the help of the right-wing Social Democratic leaders.

Frustrated in its attempts to solve the crisis of capitalism by means of peaceful expansion of its "sphere" of influence, alarmed by the growing threat of workers' counter-offensive all over the world and menaced by the imminence of a new crisis of overproduction which is inevitable, American imperialism is making hectic preparations for a new world war. All these preparations will only intensify the capitalist crisis and meet with increasing resistance from the toiling people all over the world, rousing them to fight all the more against war and imperialist domination.

II. CHANGES IN INDIA DURING WORLD WAR II AND ECONOMIC BASIS OF COLLABORATIONIST POLICY OF BOURGEOISIE

IN India, the British imperialists saw the menacing tide of revolution, irrepressible and advancing, and realised that the days of the old order were over. The old colonial rule in which British imperialism was the avowed master and was supported by a feudal retinue, bureaucrats, landlords, etc., was an order based on perpetuation of feudalism and opposition to the bourgeoisie.

It was an order which could be maintained only by the most naked use of force—for neither imperialism nor the Princes had any social base, while the order oppressed the entire people alike.

It was an order which was maintained by repressing the people and keeping the bourgeoisie away from State power as well as by obstructing its economic development.

Imperialism could rule in this way only so long as the movement for national emancipation had not risen to huge dimensions.

The imperialist policy of obstructing capitalist development threw the bourgeoisie into opposition, into the people's camp, and made it oscillate between revolution and imperialism. The bourgeoisie, though drawn by self-interest to join the anti-imperialist movement, always acted as a brake on the militancy of the movement and repeatedly compromised at the expense of the people.

The post-war situation saw the national revolutionary discontent reaching the level of armed struggle in India. The national bourgeoisie, though it lost the gamble of a "swift and short struggle" in 1942—which relied for its success on Fascist advance—had neverthe-

less increased its strength and influence over the people enormously, because the people looked upon the 1942 struggle as an anti-imperialist struggle and the national bourgeois leadership as its leader. The exploitation of the anti-imperialist discontent in 1942 now paid its dividend. The national bourgeois leadership could now head and unite the discontent if it so wished. Imperialism realised that that would sound the death-knell of its rule.

The way to bar the revolution, to save the old order, was to purchase the very leaders who were at the head of the national movement and thus broaden the social base of the Government, split the revolutionary forces and strike at them.

Menaced by the revolutionary wave, and finding the bourgeoisie also frightened by it and therefore agreeable to compromise, imperialism struck a deal with the bourgeoisie and proclaimed it as independence and freedom. Imperialism was basing itself on a new class —the national bourgeoisie, whose leaders had placed themselves at the head of the national movement and who were immensely useful in beating down the revolutionary wave.

The objective was the same as in Europe. It was to forge new economic chains to enslave the country and while formally transferring power to the bourgeoisie, keep it as a permanent junior partner in operating the State. The object was to install a reactionary Government of vested interests in power, which while protecting the imperialist order, would screen imperialist designs.

This imperialist way out of the crisis is the way of continued subjection, of national enslavement, of retaining the colonial order, its poverty and ruin, of hampering industrial development and keeping the feudal framework intact.

It is once more an attempt to throw all the burdens of the crisis on to the backs of the people and intensify their poverty and exploitation many times. It is the way of suppressing the democracy of the toilers, the rights and liberties of the people and preparing the way for colonial fascisation. In short, imperialism is

pursuing the same objects as it pursues through the Marshall Plan in Europe.

Basis of Revolutionary Wave

The basis for the post-war revolutionary wave and the collaboration between British imperialism and the national bourgeoisie was laid during the course of the war itself when the process of colonial exploitation reached its extreme limit. The colonial exploitation during the war made the Indian people extremely desperate and ready to do anything to liquidate the present order.

India's economy based on the maintenance of feudal relations on land, landlordism and feudal domains, combined with debt slavery as in ryotwari areas, an economy of scattered petty production, was already a deficit economy with the toiler remaining a starved worker all the time. The parasitic growth of landlordism, debt slavery, and feudal domains sucked dry the tiller, and agriculture decayed rapidly.

The total acreage under major foodgrains declined in the twenty years upto 1942 as follows:

In 1921-22, the area under major foodgrains was 158.6 million acres; in 1941-42, it was 156.5 million acres. The total production of major foodgrains also declined. In 1921-22, it was 54.3 million tons; in 1941-42, it was 45.7 million tons.

The yield per acre of rice had declined by 254 lbs., or 25 per cent, during the 25 years before the war. It went down from 982 lbs. per acre during 1909-13 to 728 lbs. in 1938-39.

The average yield per acre of wheat declined from 724 lbs. during 1909-13 to 636 lbs. in 1924-33. (Figures about acreage and production from *Technological Possibilities of Agriculture in India* by W. Burns.)

Out of this falling production, the tiller had to yield a major part to the landlord.

Already before the war India had to import food from Burma to make up the deficit. This fact, together with the policy of inflation which the imperialists were pursuing to finance the war at the expense of the peo-

ple, caused complete chaos and led to the death of hundreds of thousands when during the war imports from Burma stopped.

Feudal relations on land hampered intensive cultivation. They destroyed all intiative of the peasants to grow more food. They made it impossible to utilise the land fully with modern means and equipment, and starved the tiller. These relations became a fetter on the further development of production. They could be kept up by continually starving the tiller—the price was famine, hunger all round—a continuous process of pauperisation, expropriation of peasants and concentration of land in the hands of landlords, rich peasants or money-lenders. The agrarian revolution, completely eliminating all feudal exploitation and giving the land to the tiller, was the only way out.

The war and the economic results created by it aggravated all these effects ten times, making the peasantry a seething mass of anger and discontent.

The British imperialists, in possession of the country's resources, decided to finance the war by predatory methods at the expense of the people.

With the shifting of the front to India with Japan's attack, the imperialists needed goods worth millions from India, to procure which they resorted to inflation and paid India's common man, the producer, the worker and the peasant, with depreciated money. This meant not only that the nation as a whole was cheated to make a gift of 1,600 crores of rupees to Britain (the amount of Sterling Balances), but that the poorer classes of India were made to part with this 1,600 crores of rupees.

The peasant's income, the worker's wages and the salary of the middle-class employee, all were depreciated to below 50 per cent of the former income—making full allowance for the higher prices and dearness allowance given to them.

The poorer sections of the peasantry were looted from both sides. They could not get the full benefit of the rise in prices, they had to purchase industrial goods at still higher prices and also food at extortionate

prices when they went to the market to buy it towards the end of the season.

Inflation was an instrument of defrauding the peasantry from all sides, robbing and looting it, passing on the burdens of the war crisis to the starving peasant.

Its result was immense pauperisation of the peasant, still more concentration of land in the hands of the landlords and rich peasants, famine, and three million deaths during the Bengal Famine.

With prices of bullocks, iron, plough immensely risen, India's poor peasant finds it impossible to carry on cultivation and becomes a pauperised peasant. Inflation has further intensified rack-renting, ejection, illegal demands—making the life of the peasant unbearable.

Workers and the War Crisis

Imperialism continued its policy of blocking industrial development in the period of war with the result that once the war jobs are dispensed with, there will be lakhs of unemployed from the army, industries, Government services, middle-class clerks and others, without any alternative avenue of employment.

Already nearly a million persons have been thrown out of Government services. Railways, docks, civil staff—all are awaiting orders for a general retrenchment.

Indian industry in wartime prospered at the expense of the workers. No new plants were allowed, but the placing of war orders and the extortionate prices secured from the people enabled the capitalists to keep the factories working for all the twenty-four hours.

The workers, however, got their real wages reduced with a rise in the cost of living. In industries where the workers were organised and where strikes took place, the workers secured some dearness allowance, but in other cases, the compensation was a mockery.

Inflation reduced the real value of the rupee earned

by the worker to six annas or so, and threw the burdens of war on his shoulders.

This, combined with the deterioration in the quality of foodstuffs, has lowered the physical capacity of the workers, leading to their absenteeism and a steep fall in their standard of living.

The working class has been fighting against this deterioration for the last seven years.

With the close of the war, the cost of living continued to rise still further and the condition of the working class began to deteriorate still more rapidly, and in the case of a majority of peasants and a considerable proportion of workers and employees it fell too much, below 50 per cent or even less.

Even according to the official estimates which are generally gross understatements of reality, the cost-of-living index for Bombay had risen from 100 in August 1939 to 224 in 1945 and 285 in September 1947.

In Ahmedabad, the cost-of-living index rose from 100 in August 1939 to 272 in 1945 and 322 in August 1947.

In Sholapur it rose from 100 in August 1939 to 360 in September 1947.

In Kanpur (on the same basis of August 1939—100), it rose to 308 in 1945 and 420 in October 1947.

In Madras, it rose from 100 in August 1939 to 228 in 1945 and 285 in October 1947.

In Trichur (Cochin State) it rose from 100 in August 1939 to 301 in September 1947.

The all-India food index (wholesale) rose from 100 in August 1939 to 239.4 in August 1945 and to 348.5 in February 1948, that of cereals standing at 405 in February 1948. The worker's food now costs him nearly four times as much as before the war.

This attack on workers' wages was bound to unleash working-class anger. Imperialism tried to forestall it by introducing the eight-hour day (1947), some legislation for holidays with pay for certain sections of workers; appointment of the Pay Commission for Government servants.

But the discontent could not be checked. The working class, whose standard of life had already de-

teriorated during the war, who had hardly secured any compensation against the rising cost of living, began to fight back.

The all-embracing strike wave is the biggest since 1942. In 1942, the total number of workers affected was 7,72,000 and the man-days lost were 57,79,000. In 1945, the number of workers affected was 7,47,000 and the man-days lost were 40,54,000. In 1946, the number of workers affected rose to the unprecedented figure of 19,61,000, or nearly two million, and the man-days lost were 1,27,17,000, or over 12 million. In the first eight months of 1947, the number of workers on strike was 13,23,253 and the man-days lost were 1,11,95,863.

This huge strike wave clearly shows that the economic crisis is rapidly gathering momentum and the masses have already started a desperate fight against the impoverishment caused by the crisis.

Conditions in the industrial areas are rapidly leading to widespread industrial unrest in textiles, railways, etc., to workers' anger against mass unemployment and lock-outs, for a struggle for nationalisation and a living wage, for industrial planning and removal of industrial anarchy.

The imperialists and the bourgeoisie are intent on solving the crisis at the expense of the workers, by means of rationalisation, reducing the wage-bill, stopping all further social legislation and speeding up in the name of national production.

The working class, however, can be satisfied only with a living wage, nationalisation, limitation of profits, which means that experience is bringing the working class to demand the putting into effect of the whole programme of the democratic revolution. Once more there are only two ways: the capitalist-imperialist way or the people's revolutionary way.

The petty bourgeoisie, the vast mass of it, is drawn into the vortex of the crisis as never before. First, the students fighting and striking for cheaper education, for the lowering of fees, disclose the discontent in middle-class households over present conditions which are weighted in favour of the rich. The vast mass of petty-bourgeois earners, clerks, Govern-

ment servants, secondary and primary school teachers —all have undergone the worst kind of hell during the war years. They were the worst victims of the black-market, they were the last to get any addition to their salaries by way of dearness allowance, and now with their patience exhausted, they are resorting to strikes.

The people of the Indian States have also gone through the horrors of food crisis, blackmarketing, extraordinary prices and denial of necessities. The unprecedented awakening caused by the rapid deterioration of economic conditions, the fight against which was often led by the working class, has led the States' people to blaze the new trail for a democratic upsurge in movements like that of "Quit Kashmir." The States' subjects, driven to desperation, have challenged Princely rule in Travancore and Hyderabad and made every Prince quake with fear.

The galvanisation of this front against autocracy shows the all-pervading character of the democratic upsurge.

No section of the oppressed people can tolerate the present order. Their movement has a spontaneous direction—the change of the existing order.

Economic Basis of Collaboration

But if war conditions made the people desperate, they made the bourgeoisie look to imperialism for a new alliance.

First, the war, though it fleeced the poor—the working class, the toiling peasantry, etc.—immensely enriched the Indian bourgeoisie, placing in its hands an enormous amount of liquid capital.

Industrial profits rose to giddy heights. The Economic Adviser to the Government of India gave the following figures:

General Index of Industrial Profits

(*Base* 1928—100)

1939	..	72.4
1940	..	99.9
1941	..	135.4
1942	..	169.4

INDEX OF INDUSTRIAL PROFITS (*Textiles*)
(*Base* 1928—100)

1939	..	154.6
1940	..	220.1
1941	..	489.1
1942	..	760.7

(From *Recent Social and Economic Trends in India*, 1946.)

The huge Government orders, which enabled the factories to run twenty-four hours and ensured a steady market for the goods, the scarcity of commodities for civilian consumption because of Government demand which enabled the capitalists to charge inconceivable prices besides allowing them to make huge blackmarket profits, made the Indian bourgeoisie a willing partner in the common loot and placed an enormous amount of liquid capital in its hands. Never had "Indian" industry seen such prosperous days; never was the market so attractive; never did profits pour down in millions like this.

Notwithstanding the Excess Profits Tax and other measures, the Indian capitalist class gained enormously in the war. In fact, through inflation and high prices, the Government made an unwritten pact with the Indian bourgeoisie to make sure of a steady supply of goods in return for huge profits through looting the people.

The Indian bourgeoisie was not willing to subscribe to Government loans. Its leadership—the leadership of the National Congress—was bringing pressure on the Government through the "August struggle." It, therefore, could not be drawn into an easy economic cooperation in supplying the economic needs of the Government. In fact, in the 1942 struggle two of the biggest industries — Jamshedpur and Ahmedabad—organised lock-outs to bring pressure on the Government.

Only a huge bribe could quieten them for the time being—the mechanism of prices, of inflation, of continually rising profits. Even though the industrialists were supposed to deliver part of their production at

controlled prices to the Government, they could charge anything from the civilian population in the blackmarket and thus reap huge profits. That is why the Govenment did not attack the capitalists for their blackmarket transactions; that is why it appointed them on the Textile and other Boards and allowed them to sabotage such schemes as that of Standard Cloth.

The rise of prices in the open market as well as in the blackmarket is the measure of the loot which the capitalists were able to garner in the war period through the imperialist mechanism of robbing the people through inflation and depreciation of their labour.

The growing accumulation of liquid capital in the hands of industrialists, merchants and traders has solved one of the big problems of the national bourgeoisie—the availability of liquid capital in a poor country. Capital is no longer shy.

This accumulation has made the Indian bourgeoisie —Big Business—ambitious and to look in all directions for investment. The Tata-Birla Plan, propounded by India's money-bags, was an advertisement to the world that Indian capitalists were prepared to invest in a big way and to invite big capital for high stakes. It was the measure of the Indian capitalists' ambition born out of a new confidence created by looted and accumulated cash.

At the same time the capitalists are shrewd enough to understand their own dependence on British and American capital.

British imperialism has successfully denuded Indian industry of all replacement machinery; it has prevented the import of any new machinery to start new industries. Through the Eastern Group Commission and the refusal to implement even the Grady Report, it kept Indian industry on a breakdown level during the war.

Renewal and replacement alone will require machinery worth crores of rupees, apart from that required to satisfy the grand ambitions of Indian Big Business. America and Britain possess the monopoly of capital goods.

Notwithstanding the growth of liquid capital and ambitions, Indian Big Business is hemmed in from all sides by its backwardness, colonial limitations and dependence on Britain—factors which the latter is fully exploiting.

Indian Big Business was counting on India's Sterling Balances amounting to Rs. 1,600 crores for large-scale import of capital goods without any difficulty about securing foreign exchange. The bourgeoisie thought that it could successfully negotiate a deal over this vast sum and secure capital goods at the earliest opportunity.

But the British and American imperialists have joined hands to repudiate the major part of these Sterling debts and forced India to agree to it for the sake of paltry concessions or the release of a very small part of it.

The British, of course, never intend to pay back the Sterling Balances but only hold out the bait of releasing part of them as a weapon to secure new economic bargains.

America also wants that India should not be paid back the major part of these balances so that she does not get capital goods to any appreciable extent and her bourgeoisie is made dependent on American or British mercies.

The terms of the Anglo-American Loan Agreement of December 6, 1945, entered into between the Government of the United States and the United Kingdom, lay down in clause 10:

> "The setttlements with the Sterling area countries will be on the basis of dividing these accumulated balances into three categories: (1) balances to be released at once and convertible into any currency for current transaction; (2) balances to be similarly released by instalments over a period of years beginning in 1951; and (3) balances to be adjusted as a contribution to the settlement of war and post-war indebtedness and in recognition of the benefits which the countries concerned might be expected to gain from such a settlement."

The sub-clause (3) is an open proposal to liquidate a substantial part of the balances with the bait that benefits might follow from such a settlement.

Thus the British and American imperialists are using the very debt which Britain owes to India to beat India down, to force India to scale it down in return for some benefits in the shape of capital goods, or in the alternative, to stick to her debt and forego any benefits. Immediately, that is, till India has not made a final settlement, they are not releasing any part of the balances for importing capital goods, though a part is released to import food at extortionate prices.

In order that India should be able to pay for the import of capital goods, when they are not paid out of the balances, India must export her own products to other countries and earn sufficient dollar or sterling. In the absence of a foreign loan, or utilisation of the Sterling Balances, India has no other way of importing capital goods except what she earns through her exports.

The sum earned by India through exports is too little to finance the requirements of Big Business and it is thus brought to face the bitter truth that for its very existence it is dependent on America or Britain. It will have to wait for years if it were to depend on mere exports for financing its need of capital goods. In fact, it will not be able to replace old machinery for years this way.

The refusal to pay back the balances, the insistence on financing imports of capital goods through foreign exchange earned in exports, are devices of imperialism to strengthen the economic dependence of India on the British and American imperialists and force the Indian bourgeoisie down to servile economic agreements.

They are also instruments of drawing the Indian bourgeoisie into the Anglo-American economic net, baiting it by the offer of larger export markets in Anglo-American colonies.

The repeated entreaties for releasing at least a part of the Sterling Balances show the dependence of the Indian bourgeoisie on imperialist mercies.

The Indian bourgeoisie itself is already in need of

foreign markets in view of the falling Indian market due to the economic crisis. It knows that unless some outlet is given Indian industry might collapse in a big way.

But this dependence on foreign markets is nothing but dependence on the colonies and semi-colonies of Britain or America, which enables the latter to force down any conditions before access to these markets is given. The foreign exchange earned through this trade will constitute a mere trifle in relation to India's capital requirements and will constantly goad Indian Big Business to shed all the formal trappings of independence and come as a beggar for alms and completely depend on imperialism.

Indian Big Business itself, in its ambition, is looking to widespread foreign markets—to the entire South East Asia—and looking upon itself as the inheritor of the mantle thrown off by Japan. The Indian bourgeoisie realises that its plan of expansion cannot be realised without foreign markets, and members of the Union Government are already talking about exports to South East Asiatic countries. The desire to exploit the peoples of South East Asia with the help of imperialists is one of the most powerful factors in bourgeois politics. The need for foreign markets is the logical conclusion of a desire to develop industries on a capitalist basis with the colonial order kept intact.

Both for its immediate needs—replacement, immediate exports to avoid collapse of industry—and its big plans of expansion of industry, import of capital goods, finding of new markets, release of Sterling Balances, the national bourgeoisie needs collaboration with imperialism, as without imperialism it will not even be able to run its industry regularly, nor expand it.

The businessmen know that these are the crucial years when either industry expands, new markets are captured before the other nations suffering from war devastation come out as competitors, or they go bankrupt. That is why they need collaboration very badly.

This desire for collaboration, therefore, takes the shape of retaining the colonial order and willingly inviting foreign capital for joint concerns. They agree to

make wide and sweeping concessions to foreign capital in return for securing access to other colonial markets.

The secret of the joint concerns, planned by Indian big businessmen but not yet executed, is this. The Indian capitalists finding no other way of getting capital goods are prepared to accept the most extortionate terms from the monopolists of these goods.

The full meaning of this collaboration is seen in the terms demanded by imperialism and accepted by the Indian bourgeoisie.

Foreign capital through the Havana Trade Pact is demanding full equality, full compensation in case the State takes over any concern; that no measures of nationalisation be carried through, a demand which the Indian Government, itself opposed to nationalisation, has found easy to satisfy through its recent statement of policy when it says that there will be no nationalisation for five years; it demands that no discrimination be made between home and foreign capital; that tariff walls be not raised against foreign capital without previous consultation; and that full security be offered to it, meaning security against labour and State intervention.

These terms, accepted by the Indian bourgeoisie, were openly put in the several speeches of the arrogant American Ambassador to India, Dr. Grady. Speaking in April 1947 in New York, Dr. Grady demanded a fundamental reorganisation of India's taxation structure to suit the needs of the American imperialists for unhampered exploitation of India.

> "He was of the opinion that the obstacles to maximum economic cooperation such as the present complicated tax structure that hampered the conduct of manufacturing operations in India by foreign companies could be removed by treaties or agreements"—in short, the State should not encroach through taxation on the profits of the foreign concerns.

Demanding a war on protective tariffs, etc., in the name of world recovery and American assistance and

sympathy, Dr. Grady stated (Calcutta, October 28, 1947) :

> "Until there is truly one-world trading system with bilateralism, preferences and all other forms of exclusive trade advantage eliminated or at least in the process of progressive reduction, world prosperity will be shackled...."

Speaking in November 1947 in Calcutta, Dr. Grady said

> "that he was not in a position to state what attitude the Export and Import Bank would take for advancing loans to India if the Government of dia decided to go ahead with wholesale plans of nationalisation. But if a middle course between private enterprise and State institutions was followed then he believed there would not be much difficulty ...."—thus openly coming out against any genuine nationalisation.

To these insolent demands the reply of the Indian Union Government has been one of meek acceptance with only verbal modifications here and there.

Speaking to the Associated Chambers of Commerce in Calcutta on December 1947, Pandit Nehru said:

> "We cannot have any special privilege for any foreign interest in India. There is a large field especially for the next few years and we want co-operation with other countries during the process of India's development, and I think British and other foreign interests that exist in India will and should have this large field open to them."

This open welcome to foreign interests, seeking to dominate India, though verbally qualified by a declaration of no special privileges, shows how the Government is begging for foreign help.

In practice it accepts one by one all the terms which the foreign capitalists want.

At the Industries Conference, which met in Jan. 1948 in New Delhi, the Government gave a secret understanding to the Indian capitalists that there would

be no nationalisation for at least five years to come, thus accepting the demand of Dr. Grady. The resolution which the Conference passed on foreign capital kept quiet on all the insolent demands made, and contented itself by saying that the conditions under which foreign capital is invested in India should be regulated by national interests, and private deals between Indian and foreign capitalists should have the formal approval of the Government.

What results from this is not industrial revolution, not the freeing of agrarian economy from feudal bondage, but the establishment of a few industrial concerns as give some outlet to the accumulated capital without endangering the interests of Anglo-American imperialism; the establishment of such concerns as fits in with the Anglo-American scheme of exploiting the world and drawing India into its war plans.

If this is welcomed by the bourgeoisie it only reveals the narrow and anti-national character of its intentions. But for the mass of the people it only means continuation of feudal exploitation, low wages, no industrial revolution, but continued poverty, unemployment, crisis and famine—the price of tying India to the capitalist order, of collaboration and joint exploitation. That is where the Indian bourgeoisie, and the national leadership which represents it, are taking India—to economic dependence on Anglo-America, subservience to them and to growing poverty for the people.

The collaboration thus represents an economic and political alliance against the democratic revolution through which alone the people can liberate themselves from the yoke of the colonial order, of landlordism, of the Princes and of foreign and home capitalists. It is directed against the agrarian revolution, against the nationalisation of industries, a living wage and planning, and against the widespread industrial expansion which can only be realised on the basis of nationalisation. It is calculated to guard the present order with the bourgeoisie playing the role of a junior partner to imperialism.

Imperialism Needs Collaboration

The need for collaboration arises from the other side also. Otherwise it might be asked: if the bourgeoisie is so dependent, why do the imperialists not continue in the old way, why is even junior partnership given?

First, the war has meant a certain change in the economic relationship between India and Britain. The repatriation of the Sterling debt has meant that Britain's capacity to drain goods without payment, and thereby automatically have a lien over India's exports of raw materials, has declined, which also affects her capacity to export goods to India. Britain, therefore, stands badly in need of new investments in India which will restore the old balance of payments and automatically influence the direction of Indian trade towards her. It is, therefore, in her imperialist interests that she should get access to new investments, taking care that they do not conflict with the basic interests at home.

Secondly, Britain is afraid that if she were not to placate the Indian bourgeoisie, America might enter into a deal with it. The Indian bourgeoisie, helped by America, might become a second rival, and, therefore, concessions must be made and collaboration has to be achieved.

Thirdly, as an opponent, Indian capital has become a powerful adversary. It is not the old weakling that it was. It has the powerful backing of the national movement which it can exploit against any plan for pure British concerns and a total refusal to make concessions. It has made it impossible to open purely British concerns and concentrate State patronage on them, and thus is in a position to obstruct British investments or plans of exploitation.

And politically, the situation is such that pure British concerns like a pure imperialist State cannot run unless the bourgeoisie is won over. "Law and order" cannot be maintained, strikes cannot be suppressed, and British lives cannot be protected without the aid of the national leadership which represents the bourgeoisie and controls the people.

Therefore, both political and economic bargains become necessary to protect the old order.

The so-called "transfer of power" was one of the biggest pieces of political and economic appeasement of the bourgeoisie—which was necessary to strike a deal. This power, putting the bourgeoisie in control over the manpower and resources of a vast territory, though as a junior partner, was the dream of the bourgeoisie and it has realised it.

From the standpoint of the revolution all that it means is that henceforth the bourgeoisie will guard the colonial order.

Along with this are being negotiated "treaties as between the equals" for trade, industry, commerce—treaties with the condition mentioned before—treaties which enslave India but enable the bourgeoisie to become a junior partner in the joint exploitation of India.

The concession about exports, about capital goods, etc., however petty they may seem in relation to the needs of the masses, are real in relation to the selfish and petty needs of the colonial bourgeoisie, sufficient for collaboration and betrayal.

This is the economic and political basis of collaboration between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie.

III. POST-WAR REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE AND NEW POLICIES OF IMPERIALISM AND INDIAN BOURGEOISIE — NEW CLASS ALIGNMENT

THE deep economic crisis and the intensified imperialist exploitation of the war years, which have brought unbearable suffering and starvation to the broad masses of the toiling and common people and sharpened their political consciousness and militancy, continued to operate as a mighty force in the post-war years behind the rising revolutionary fight of the masses.

Despite the secret military plans to crush the struggle which British imperialist statesmen hatched behind the curtain, while they publicly talked of a peaceful transfer of power and of quitting India; despite their backstair intrigues to pitch the Congress and League against each other and provoke a fratricidal war; despite the compromising, disruptive and anti-struggle policies pursued by the Congress and League leaderships; the tempo, the sweep and the militancy of the struggles of the workers and employees in the cities, of the peasants and tenant-serfs in the countryside, of the common people in the feudal autocratic States went on rising steadily in 1945-46.

The sweep of the struggle swept even into the armed forces leading to mutinies and rebellions, strikes and hartals in the imperial armies. Gandhi's non-violent India, guarded by the bourgeoisie for more than a quarter century against any militant action, now suddenly resorted to arms. The development of the struggles into armed clashes signified a new stage of the revolutionary struggle—the final phase when the toiling masses and the common people rise in defiance of imperialism and the victory of the democratic revolution becomes imminent.

The second characteristic feature of the situation was the great role played by the working class in these struggles—economic and political. The strikes of the working class became the great cohesive and centralising force when the bourgeoisie was abjuring struggle and the National Congress was withdrawing from it. In fact, many of the glorious struggles took place in the teeth of opposition from national leaders.

The developing strikes for economic demands and the mass participation of the working class in the political protest strikes were leading the entire struggle in the direction of an all-India general strike, supported by the armed forces and Government servants.

India has never seen such a sweep; never seen the armed forces collapsing so easily before popular pressure; never seen the working class fighting with such abandon and courage.

It was the eve of the total collapse of imperialism.

The heroic fighting spirit of the striking workers was shown in the ease with which the workers responded to the call for protest strikes on every national and anti-imperialist issue. It was seen in the rapid spread of strike enthusiasm to other employees, to bank clerks, peons, primary teachers and to Government servants.

A similar movement started in the armed forces. In 1945 when it was known that tens of thousands of the captured patriotic INA men were being maltreated in several concentration camps, and when the victory-mad imperialists launched a treason trial against the INA leaders, the whole country rose in flaming indignation and demanded their unconditional release.

In November 1945 the students and the workers of Calcutta became the spearhead of big protest hartals and strike demonstrations. They marched under the joint flags of the Congress, the League and the Communist Party and were fired upon by the police and the military. It was then that the first martyrs of the post-war period fell.

In January 1946 the British Commander-in-Chief had to bow down before the popular storm and release the INA prisoners.

Hard on the heels of the release of the INA demonstrations, and powerfully influenced by them, came the discontent in the ranks of the Royal Indian Navy and the Royal Indian Air Force.

The naval ratings struck work and went on hunger strike for their demands in the ships and shore-establishments. They demonstrated for their demands in the city, demanded the release of INA men and the withdrawal of the Indian troops from Indonesia. They ran up the Congress, League and Red Flags on their ships.

The naval officers, bewildered and panic-stricken by the new revolutionary spirit in the navy, sought to supress them by arrests and bullets. Then it was that these navy men seized their ships and fired back. By their heroic, though short-lived, resistance the navy men of Bombay and Karachi heralded the beginning of a new period of revolutionary upheaval. Their revolutionary spirit and united action sent a thrill through the ranks of all branches of the Indian armed forces.

Men of the RIAF struck in several places in fraternal solidarity with the RIN. The Indian troops, wherever they were called out against the revolting men, refused to fire.

The Indian working class, led by the Communist Party, instinctively saw in the naval rising a historic turning point in our freedom struggle and supported it by total protest strikes and hartals in Bombay, Calcutta, Trichinopoly, Madras and Madura.

The total strike and hartal in Bombay on February 22, 1946, which came as an instantaneous counter-challenge to Admiral Godfrey's insolent threat to destroy the revolting navy and despite the opposition of Sjt. Vallabhbhai Patel and the Congress leadership, struck panic into the hearts of the imperialists. They called out White troops with tanks and armoured cars to spread terror and murder in the streets. Over 200 citizens fell victims to their bullets in two days.

The naval rising and the great solidarity action staged by the advanced guard of the Indian working class in its support were not isolated incidents. They

were a flaming signal which announced to the world that a volcanic discontent, an anti-imperialist urge, was smouldering in the minds of the Indian people and their armed forces, ready to be united and harnessed for the final annihilation of the rotten structure of the imperialist-feudal rule.

One has only to recapitulate the striking events and mass actions of the first six months of 1946 to be convinced of the truth of this.

Within a week of the RIN strike, more than 300 military sepoys stationed at Jubbulpore struck work and paraded throughout the streets with all the three flags, Congress, League and Red (March 4).

On March 8, the workers and citizens of Delhi observed a protest strike and hartal against the victory celebrations. The Town Hall was attacked and set on fire.

On March 18, the Gurkha soldiers of Dehra Dun revolted in protest against insulting remarks by officers.

Delhi policemen went on hunger strike for wage increase and the military was used to arrest them.

Policemen of Allahabad went on hunger strike in protest against ration cut (March 19).

Ten thousand Bihar policemen went on strike on April 3.

Side by side with this beginning of insurrectionary atmosphere in the armed forces and the police, a tremendous strike wave was rising among the working class.

This terrific pace of events in the rest of India was producing the first repercussions among the peoples of the feudal autocratic States.

The people of Kashmir launched in May 1946 a movement for the end of autocracy of the Dogra House and for the immediate introduction of a democratic Constitution. The Ruler promptly arrested Sheikh Abdulla and unleashed a reign of terror against the Kashmiri people, who, however, struck back and performed marvels of heroic resistance.

It was clear that a new round of States' people's struggles, this time for the final abolition of Princely autocracy, was being heralded by the fighting people

of Kashmir, and the people of the rest of India were preparing to support them.

Thus the countrywide movement which grew round the demand for the release of the INA men and the naval rising of February marked the beginning of a new period which was not just of mounting discontent and unrest but one which immediately placed on the agenda the democratic revolution and the task of vanquishing imperialism and its collaborators.

The paralysis of the imperialist system was seen not only in the breakdown of its economic structure, the poverty and hunger it created, but in the disintegration of the armed and the police forces which were no longer able to resist the popular pressure and revolutionary upheaval.

Imperialism saw the writing on the wall and opened negotiations with the two bourgeois parties, the Congress and the League. But it was not only imperialism that was frightened by the menace of the approaching revolution. The bourgeois leaderships of the National Congress and the Muslim League clearly saw that the struggle of the masses was getting beyond control and was bringing to the forefront the working class and the exploited masses. They, therefore, were eager for compromise and began to attack the militant struggles of the people.

The policies pursued by the leaderships of the Congress and the Muslim League corresponded to the bourgeois vested interests which they represent and not to the anti-imperialist and democratic aspirations of the vast masses that they claim to lead.

Both the leaderships resiled in panic from the manifestations of mass upheaval against the imperialist-feudal rule and were ready to welcome the Cabinet Mission as soon as it was announced and to seek cooperation with imperialism.

When the Cabinet Mission came with its plan, the Congress leadership turned even more anti-struggle. Its Ministries let loose a wave of repression against the working-class and peasant struggles. It set its face against the struggles of the States' peoples in order to appease the Princes and betrayed the struggle of

the Kashmiri people. Instead of rejecting the plan with its non-sovereign constitution-making body and retention of the Princes, as a plan of masked British domination and as one based on the imperialist policy of divide and rule, it accepted it with minor criticisms.

The leadership of the National Congress, representing the interests of the Indian capitalist class, thus betrayed the revolutionary movement at a time when it was on the point of overthrowing the imperialist order. It only exploited the movement to win the maximum concessions possible for its own selfish interests and disrupted for the time being the growing revolutionary movement. By detaching the Congress from the movement, by isolating these spontaneously developing militant struggles, by repressing them, the national leadership played the game of disrupting the battle against imperialism and pursued a policy of repressing it.

The leadership of the Muslim League, representing the interests of the Muslim capitalists and landlords, had always played a disruptive and anti-national role through its policy of communalism, its slogan of division of India and its general policy of obstructing the national emancipatory struggle headed by the Congress. The Muslim League leadership capitalised the backwardness of the Muslim masses and the failure of the national reformist leadership to draw the Muslim masses into the common struggle, and succeeded in giving the freedom urge of the Muslim masses a distorted expression. The hypocritical talk of "Muslim freedom," of saving the Muslims from the Hindus, stood exposed when in connection with the RIN strike in Bombay, Mr. Jinnah came out against the participation of Muslim workers and people in the common demonstration, and betrayed his fear of independent mass action.

Throughout this period the Muslim League did its best to keep the Muslim masses away from the developing revolutionary wave but did not always succeed. It had sometimes to start demonstrations on its own (demonstration in Calcutta for the release of the INA prisoner Rashid Ali) to give an outlet to the anti-im-

perialist sentiment of the Muslim masses. The Muslim League leadership was concentrating only on blackmailing the Congress and through obstruction to secure its separatist demand of Pakistan.

It also, therefore, readily took to negotiations on the basis of the Cabinet Mission's Plan. The Muslim League leadership thus betrayed the revolutionary movement and revealed itself once more as an agency of upper-class interests, out to sell the freedom movement for its own selfish gains.

British imperialism, standing in immediate need of erecting a barrier to the revolutionary movement, saw the necessity of placating the Congress to the utmost limit. It realised that only by using the Congress leadership against the revolutionary movement could the imperialist order be saved.

At the same time, having drawn the Congress into negotiations, imperialism fully exploited the fear of the Congress leaders of revolution, their need for economic help from Britain, their conflict with League, and the independent existence of the Princely autocracy, to make them willingly accept the Mountbatten Plan.

The original Cabinet Mission Plan did not provide for direct partition; this was a concession made to Congress pressure. But as soon as the purely Congress-manned Interim Government came into existence the pressure of riots was worked up, taking advantage of the "Direct Action" launched by the League. Pressure was also worked later through Cabinet members of the Muslim League, when it afterwards joined the Government, making it impossible for the Congress to function the Government. The leaders of the Congress were thus forced to accept partition of India.

Real Face of the Mountbatten Award

The Mountbatten Award comes as a culmination of the betrayal of the revolutionary struggle by the National Congress and the League leaderships.

Though the bourgeois leaderships parade the story that independence has been won, the fact is that the

freedom struggle has been betrayed and the national leadership has struck a treacherous deal behind the back of the starving people, betraying every slogan of the democratic revolution.

The Mountbatten Plan partitioned India. The national bourgeois leaderships of the Congress and the Muslim League, which had always opposed the solution of the communal problem on the basis of the just and revolutionary principle of self-determination of nationalities, accepted the imperialist solution of partition on the basis of religion. This enabled imperialism to organise the ghastliest riots and mass butcheries of minorities, creating permanent hostility between Hindus and Muslims, and to work up war fever between the two States when required in imperialist interests. The partition is a ready-made weapon to organise riots and sidetrack the revolutionary movement by war appeals. It is one of the biggest attacks on the unity and integrity of the democratic movement and is also used to weaken the bourgeoisie of both the States *vis-a-vis* imperialism.

Secondly, the plan keeps the Princes, the age-old friends of the imperial order, intact and enhances their bargaining power, enabling the national leaders to parade their accession as a great triumph, for the Princes are now supposed to be independent.

Thirdly, the leading economic strings are still in the hands of the imperialists, who successfully use them to make the bourgeoisie move against the masses, crush the democratic revolution and establish a new line-up of imperialism, Princes, landlords, and the bourgeoisie.

The Mountbatten Plan is the expression of this alliance against the democratic revolution—an alliance which seeks to drown the revolution in blood. It crowns the process of bourgeois vacillation with final capitulation. It is the fruit of the national leadership's compromising policy, culminating in an avowedly anti-national, anti-people and anti-revolutionary policy.

What the Mountbatten Plan has given to the people is not real but fake independence. Through this award British imperialism partitioned India on com-

munal lines and gave to the bourgeoisie an important share of State power, subservient to itself.

Britain's domination has not ended, but the form of domination has changed. The bourgeoisie was so long kept out of State power and in opposition to it; now it is granted a share of State power in order to disrupt and drown the national democratic revolution in blood.

The supreme organs of the State, the army, the navy, the air force, and the bureaucracy, are controlled by the servitors of imperialism. They are dominated by upper-class elements, officered by them, by old bureaucrats who have pronounced pro-British sympathies and bitterly hate all democratic advance. And the final imperialist control will be registered through Military Missions and Military Advisers—"willingly accepted" by the Indian Government.

The behaviour of the military, the police and the civil service in face of the riot offensive of communal elements clearly demonstrates how anti-popular, anti-democratic and pro-imperialist elements control these organs of the State—elements on which the bourgeoisie safely relies for the law and order of collaboration.

At the same time the representatives of the bourgeoisie, the traditional leaders of the national movement, are handed over the reins of Government, while being dominated by imperialism through trade pacts and an open military alliance which is in the process of formation.

The Mountbatten Award does not really signify a retreat of imperialism but its cunning counter-offensive against the rising forces of the Indian people. This is demonstrated by the communal carnage and the set-back to the democratic and anti-imperialist struggles after August 15.

British imperialism was forced to change the forms of its domination as a result of the growing popular upsurge for freedom and democracy during the war and post-war days. Faced with the alternative of quitting India, it has given a share of power to the capitalists and landlords in order to be able to remain. To parade this new status as national freedom or as

national advance is to shield imperialist designs and the subservience of the national bourgeoisie.

National Government and the People

The deeds and actions of the "National Government" since August 15 fully prove this understanding of the purpose behind the Mountbatten Plan.

The establishment of the Central Government headed by Pandit Nehru has not solved a single problem of the democratic revolution. Its establishment does not mean that the Indian people have won either freedom or independence, nor does it ensure that they will be moving in the direction of democracy and freedom for the people.

On the contrary, the Government has already made a big move in the opposite direction—against the interests and freedom of the people. It is linking itself with the Anglo-American bloc of imperialist Powers—a bloc which seeks to crush all democratic revolutions and to create satellite States. It is manoeuvring to find an advantageous position for itself in the Anglo-American bloc.

The recent acts of the National Government prove beyond doubt that its policy is to suppress freedom and democracy.

The Constituent Assembly, manned by the same leaders as lead the National Government, is preparing an authoritarian Constitution. The working class and the Indian people will not get anything except the right to vote at long intervals and that too only for the Provincial Assemblies. The Constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly will be a Constitution for the uppper classes to rule the oppressed millions in the interests of joint exploitation by the Indian and British capitalists.

The Constitution provides for arrest without warrant and detention without trial; it authorises the Provincial Governors to act in their discretion, legislate by ordinance and rule by proclamation, thus usurping the powers of the Legislature and overruling them in the name of grave emergency.

It includes the reactionary provision for Second Chambers in Provinces and allows for nomination of members to the Council by the Governor, thus ensuring that the vested interests and their upper-class spokesmen will have a dominant voice in the Chamber.

The model Constitution for Provinces further does not accept the basic right of linguistic national units to self-determination, thus expressing clearly the reactionary bourgeois interests which seek to dominate the different nationalities.

It does not provide for proportional representation, without which the progressive political parties and the various minority groups cannot get fair representation. It does not provide for freedom and self-determination of the tribal and other backward peoples enabling the formation of autonomous regions or provinces, without which these backward people cannot economically and culturally protect and develop themselves.

Under the Constitution the basic and fundamental rights of the toilers, such as right to work, right to a living wage, equal pay for equal work, right to old-age, sickness and unemployment aid, are denied and do not find a place in the fundamental rights which the new State of India is bound by the Constitution to guarantee and protect.

While these rights of the mass of toilers are not guaranteed, the property and the privileges of the vested interests are specifically granted protection by a clause in the fundamental rights that no property of a person or corporation shall be taken over for public use except by payment of compensation, thus preventing through a constitutional guarantee all plans of nationalisation of industries including foreign concerns.

The Government is carrying out the plan of Indian Big Business to oppose nationalisation, suppress the workers and demand more production through longer hours of work; intensification of labour and rationalisation; freezing of wages in the name of stopping the wage-price spiral; sabotaging the implementation of gains secured by the workers (Railway agreement); holding forth no hope of legislation for a living wage,

social security or curtailment of management's power of dismissal; assuring the capitalists of full freedom to loot the people in the name of building a "mixed economy," while slandering the workers for the fall in production, demanding an increase in the hours of work. In short, it is passing the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of workers to keep up capitalist profits.

The control of the Government by the national leadership has placed an additional and powerful weapon in its hands to sabotage the revolutionary struggles against Princely autocracy. It has persistently raised illusions that Princely autocracy can be fought through governmental pressure and has utilised them to enter into accession agreements with the Princes which keep autocracy intact. By parading accession as a big triumph, attention is sidetracked from the democratic struggles inside the States. The latest act of betrayal is the Standstill Agreement with the Nizam.

In a number of bigger States the bourgeois leadership has used the popular movements against Princedom to get limited constitutional reforms which do not give power to the people but give a minor share of power to the bourgeoisie. In exchange they have joined hands with the Princes to defend feudal exploitation and oppression of the people and to disrupt and suppress all popular democratic movements.

The policy that the Government follows can only be described as one of supporting feudal reaction and sabotaging the revolutionary, anti-feudal, anti-imperialist struggle.

In the matter of civil liberties and democratic rights, the Provincial Governments, under the guidance of the Central Government, have passed the blackest acts—Public Safety Acts—which are freely used against the rising workers' and peasants' movements and against the students; hundreds are detained without trial, externed or interned.

The leadership of the Central Government has applied the brake to the agrarian legislation of the Provincial Ministries, which itself was an attempt to

cheat the peasant in the name of the abolition of landlordism. Saddled with compensation and with no provision for land to the tiller, the legislation is not even a mild reform, retains landlordism under different forms, and is an attempt to split the peasant movement and disrupt the growing forces of the agrarian revolution. It is an attempt to broaden the basis of the present bourgeois Government.

In the matter of minorities, the Government follows a communal policy, which is essentially the bourgeois way of inciting majority-minority conflict. This leads it to practise discrimination and favouritism against the minorities, depriving them of their fundamental democratic rights, and to retreat before the more ruthless and direct incitement of communal conflict by feudal-imperialist reaction, which has resulted in the mass murder of minorities in certain areas.

The admission of Hindu Sabha leader, Shyamaprosad Mukherjee, into the Cabinet and the retention of Akali leader, Baldev Singh, in the important position of Defence Minister, taken together with the open encouragement given to communal reaction, shows how the Government itself wanted to use the weapon of communal division, even before the mass massacres had started in the Punjab.

Thus for the Government, the oppression of the minorities is a conscious and deliberate policy.

This policy, carried to its greatest lengths by Sardar Patel with his praise of the openly communal Princes (Patiala, Bharatpur, Nawanagar) and of the RSS, and his viciously communal incitement of Hindus against the Muslims and Pakistan, has lent added strength to these forces. The result is seen in the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi by a leading organiser of the RSS.

So determined are the leaders of the Government to utilise and safeguard their use of this communal weapon that even after the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi, every effort is made to screen and protect reaction; angry people demonstrating against them are arrested and even shot down, a farce is enacted of arresting some of them—while in reality every occa-

sion is utilised to find an excuse to say a good word for the communalists and save them from the anger of the masses.

The arrests of Hindu Mahasabha leaders, etc., took place because the angry masses set the pace and compelled the Government to take steps against these communalists.

Even the banning of the RSS by the National Government has been done due to the tremendous mass indignation against it and is only a cover for its continued policy of shielding and allying with that organisation and the elements behind it.

According to Pandit Nehru's own statement this policy does not lead to any differences inside the Cabinet; even on this issue there are no political differences, but only temperamental differences. This should be enough to demonstrate the strong pull of communal reaction on the National Government.

Government's Economic Policy

While refusing to develop the industries of our country by nationalising key and vital industries, the Government, at the same time, is encouraging the export drive in the interests of Indian Big Business and at the expense of the people. This is a part of the plan of collaboration with Anglo-American bloc, since these export markets can only be secured in collaboration with the imperialists. By securing foreign exchange through these exports, Indian Big Business wants to purchase machinery for new industries with the help of the Anglo-American imperialists. Thus, again, it has to depend on the Anglo-American capitalists for its industries.

This double economic dependence on the Anglo-American capitalists, both for the market for Indian products and for purchasing new machinery, necessitates a servility and abject surrender to them; and Big Business, helped by the Government, is preparing to sell out India's future to the Anglo-American imperialists.

The latter are demanding a number of concess-

ions and fundamental rights—no discrimination against foreign capital, no nationalisation, no tariffs which are not agreed to, joint concerns for the exploitation of Indian people, full security to them — all of which are embodied in the Draft Trade Charter being discussed at Havana and disclose that Indian Big Business and the Government are mortgaging Indian economy to Anglo-American capital in their selfish interests. The natural result of this is not only economic but indirect political domination, so that both the economy and the political freedom of India are being mortgaged to the Anglo-American monopolists.

Government's Foreign Policy

The foreign policy of the Government follows the class interests it represents. From the very beginning Pandit Nehru adopted a line of forming a so-called third bloc—a line which represents the interests of Big Business inasmuch as it kept India away from the democratic camp and opened the way to the imperialist camp.

Recent events have torn off the mask of neutrality from the Government's foreign policy. On all crucial issues the Indian delegation has taken an anti-democratic and pro-imperialist stand — Korea, "Little Assembly," Ukraine. On the question of Ukraine it allowed itself to be exploited by the USA, and took the hypocritical stand that India stood against Ukraine because South East Asia was not represented.

On the questions crucial for the peoples of Asia in particular, e.g. the American-directed Kuomintang war against the Chinese people and the French colonial war in Viet Nam, it has remained silent and refused to act; while on the question of the Japanese Peace Treaty, it has virtually lined up with Anglo-American imperialism. Over the American-backed Dutch war against the Indonesian people, it has approved of the betrayal of the Indonesian freedom-struggle, achieved through the latest truce, put through by the US-sponsored and dominated Good Offices Committee and welcomed by President Truman.

Foreign policy depends on economic policy and India is also rapidly lining herself up with the Anglo-American bloc in matters of foreign policy. Her diplomats are already uttering anti-Soviet slanders, e.g., Sir Maharaj Singh's statement on war propaganda.

The British imperialists are giving open hints about an anti-Soviet bloc including the overseas territories of Britain, indicating that the role that India will have to play is to support the Western Bloc economically, especially with her raw materials.

Speaking in the House of Commons on January 22, Mr. Bevin, Britain's Foreign Minister, stated in connection with the formation of a bloc of Western European Powers:

> "The overseas territories of these countries (Britain, France, Holland, etc.) should be brought within this Union, so that this tremendous co-operation would stretch through Europe, the Middle East and Africa to the Far East...The Western organisation of Europe must be economically supported. That involves the closest possible collaboration with the Commonwealth and overseas territories, not only the British, but the French, Dutch, Belgian and Portuguese territories overseas. These territories are large primary producers and are capable of great development."

Along with this come reports about an alliance of South East Asian countries—embracing India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon and in agreement with Britain —an alliance of an entirely "defensive" nature; the aim of this "bloc" as openly reported is to "prevent the spread of Communism in South East Asia," which really means suppressing all struggles for freedom and democracy in South East Asia and bringing these countries directly into the imperialist camp. The Indian bourgeoisie, which is playing the role of chief agent of the imperialists for the formation of this bloc, wants all South East Asian countries to fall in line with them, that is, give up the struggle for freedom and join the imperialist camp, because it wants to prevent the Indian people from being affected by

the revolutionary struggle in these countries and also because it wants to get some foothold in these markets, with the help of imperialism, by keeping the colonial order intact.

There are also reports about Military Missions from Britain coming to India to keep her defence properly organised; reports which openly state that British statesmen do not want India or Pakistan to have any defence policy out of the orbit of the British Commonwealth, i.e., independent of British imperialism.

That is where the Government and Big Business are dragging India—from the freedom struggle to the Anglo-American camp.

New Role of the Bourgeoisie

How is it that a Government headed by the national leaders and one which came to power on the crest of a wave of popular struggles should pursue these policies?

That is so because the national leaders, who headed the popular struggles all these years and who are now in the Government, represent the class interests of the national bourgeoisie, the industrial bourgeoisie.

The leaders of the Government including Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel represent the interests of the Indian capitalist class, and the formation of the Government after August 15—after what is known as the transfer of power, but which in reality is the sharing of power—has meant an immense change in the position of the national bourgeoisie *vis-a-vis* the people and their struggles.

Formerly the national bourgeoisie and its leaders had to rely on the masses, mass struggles, etc., to secure concessions, share in power, etc., to advance their own interests. The bourgeoisie was excluded from political power, it had no real opportunity to develop industries and had no political power over the people.

The post-war revolutionary upsurge forced imperialism to change its strategy, in order to be able to strike at the democratic forces all the more ferociously.

Imperialism makes big concessions to the bourgeoisie and hands it over governmental power to rule the Indian people in its own narrow selfish interests.

At the same time, the State it has won is dependent on imperialism and is a satellite State.

In the new State, therefore, the national bourgeoisie shares power with imperialism, with the latter still dominant indirectly.

This is the secret behind the reactionary policy of the National Government. The bourgeoisie has ceased to play an oppositional role; it has renounced mass struggles to get concessions from imperialism; it is now depending on the new State and its control over the Indian people to use them as pawns in its bargaining with imperialism, whenever differences and conflicts arise. These conflicts will be solved at governmental level by offering new concessions to imperialism through Customs, lowering of tariffs, securing of joint concerns, etc.

The bourgeoisie, therefore, has turned its face away from the masses, and gone over to collaboration. That is why its Government consistently adopts an anti-mass, anti-democratic policy.

In the past, the bourgeoisie, and the national leadership which represents it, were in opposition to imperialism; now they have given up that opposition. This is the new change brought about by the transfer of power on August 15.

Henceforward the march of the democratic revolution will have to proceed directly in opposition to the bourgeois Government and its policies, and the bourgeois leadership of the Congress.

Game Behind the Riot Offensive

The fact that the Government is manned by popular leaders and that it arose on the crest of a wave of mass struggles has concealed the class character of the Government and the change in the position of its class.

The riot offensive, inspired and engineered by imperialists and their feudal reactionary agents, and their denunciation of the National Government has led many

people to believe that the feudal reactionaries were attacking a revolutionary Government and that it was the business of the people to line up unconditionally behind the Government. This is a totally wrong understanding of the situation.

The unleashing of communal riots in the Punjab, U.P. and the Indian States, the massacre of tens of thousands of innocent Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims, the forcible extermination and expulsion of minorities, the terrible sufferings and hardships inflicted on innocent men, women and children, and the economic chaos arising from all this, were pre-planned and organised by the imperialist-feudal counter-revolutionary forces. The object was to disrupt and drown the people's democratic revolution in blood. The main attack was against the people who were moving forward through strikes, armed conflicts and revolts of States' peoples to a democratic revolution.

The attempt of the forces of counter-revolution was to sidetrack the revolutionary discontent into communal channels, disorganise the people and through it consolidate a line-up of all vested interests against the mass movement, a line-up in which the bourgeoisie will move more to the Right, allying with feudal and communal interests all the more, so that a stronger front against the masses could be created.

This was to be achieved by strengthening the openly communal elements inside the Government, to appease Hindu communal reaction and surrender to the Princes on the question of maintenance of autocracy, by strengthening the consistent communal policy of Sardar Patel and checking the inconsistent and vacillating policy of Pandit Nehru.

There is no doubt that the deeply laid plot of counter-revolution very nearly succeeded in creating confusion, vacillation and demoralisation in the ranks of the people and of political parties. The main objectives were forgotten and a tendency to line up behind the Government in panic was noticed.

The imperialists and their agents would precisely like such a lining-up of the working class and democratic forces behind the Government, as it would lead

to the giving up of all efforts to carry through the democratic revolution and to the doing away with all opposition and criticism of the Government in its policy of combating all national democratic advance.

For such a policy ensures the success of their strategy. Why are riots on a mass scale possible today? Precisely because the national bourgeois leadership has, through its anti-national compromise, disorganised the forces of revolution and allowed the reactionaries to divert the discontent.

Communal riots are the direct result of the imperialist conspiracy and bourgeois compromise. Imperialism has strengthened the basis of communal riots in four ways: (i) partition which made one community hostile to another; (ii) fixation of boundaries in a manner that roused communal bitterness to its height; (iii) independent position for the States which could manoeuvre between India and Pakistan and play one against the other in a most vicious manner; (iv) communal poisoning of the most of the army chiefs and bureaucrats, which has resulted in the use of the State machinery for spreading riots.

Imperialism is instigating communal riots in order to create conditions in which the national bourgeois leadership will be increasingly forced to submit to imperialist domination, and the common toiling people will be forced to submit to the leadership of the upper classes. It also aims at smashing people's unity and crushing all democratic movements.

Fascist elements like the RSS, Hindu-Muslim-Sikh communal reactionaries and bureaucratic administrators trained up by imperialism are the chief agents for provoking riots. The Princes and landlords are at the head of them. But the bourgeoisie, including sections of the leaderships of the Congress and the League, has also played a leading part in communal riots, though certain sections of the Congress and the League leaderships have taken a stand against them.

Sections of the national bourgeois leadership also provoke riots as a matter of policy—as part of their policy towards the minorities. The policy of compromise with British imperialism, the policy of relying on

it in the conflict between the Indian Union and Pakistan, leads straight to the massacre of minorities as a weapon of intimidating the Government of the other Dominion. The massacre of Muslims, for instance, is a part of the game of intimidating Pakistan, of replying to anarchy with anarchy—a game which suits the interests of the British excellently. The minorities have become a big pawn in the game of power politics of the compromisers.

A section of the bourgeois leadership encourages and protects communal armed bands for using them against political opponents and democratic movements and for strengthening the Princes and other vested interests; they even incorporate communal armed bands into the police, Home Guard and Army.

Another section of the bourgeois leadership, while continuing the policy of compromise and thus creating conditions for riots, are scared by riots when they actually occur, due to the disorganisation of administration, trade, etc. They take only palliative measures to stop the extreme forms of riots and anarchy.

The workers, peasants and progressive intelligentsia are the most determined forces that resist all riots, just because riots smash all democratic movements. In fighting riots, they must make use of all opportunities including the Government measures to combat them.

But until the bourgeois policy of collaboration with imperialism and feudalism and its hostility to the principle of self-determination are successfully defeated, riots will take place again and again.

Not only communal riots, but other kinds of riots between one nationality and another, between the advanced castes and backward castes, between the tribal people and others, will also take place until full democracy and self-determination of the people are achieved and the imperialist hold over the organs of the State is completely smashed.

A determined fight against the reactionary policy of the Congress and the League leaderships is, therefore, essential to end the possibility of all riots. An end to these riots can only be brought about by com-

plete elimination of imperialist domination and full democratic progress.

UNMASK THE COMPROMISERS AND COMMUNALISTS

The policy of compromise with feudalism and imperialism has already bred riots and will breed more riots. Compromise feeds counter-revolution, and it is so in the case of India also.

The hands of all national leaders are equally tainted with compromise and they are all responsible for the mounting offensive of the communal elements.

Unless their compromising policies are exposed before the people, unless the people see the connection between them and the riot-offensive and push their policies back, the feudal-imperialist offensive cannot be defeated.

It is, therefore, wrong to draw basic distinctions between different national leaders on the question of their approach to the communal problem. Sardar Patel who takes an openly communal stand, and Pandit Nehru who comes out against riots and for the protection of the Muslim minority, also both move in the vicious circle created by compromise. In the final analysis, Pandit Nehru has no independent line and has to fall in line with Sardar Patel.

Pandit Nehru's own stand, which regards Hindu communalist reaction only as a reaction to Muslim communalism, and does not see in it the forces of counter-revolution; his indulgence in threats of reprisals against Pakistan on the Kashmir issue; his failure to take a bold stand against the Hindu Mahasabha and the RSS even after Gandhiji's assassination; his full acquiescence in the policy of the Central and Provincial Governments of utilising this assassination in order to strike at the democratic, revolutionary and really anti-communal forces in the country;—all these only show that Nehru has completely surrendered to Patel's policy.

The Party will utilise every opportunity to fight riots and will make use of every measure taken by the Government to stop riots. It will regard riots as an

offensive against the revolution but, at the same time, will have no illusion that the National Government can or will fight against riots.

In doing this, it is, no doubt, the duty of the Party to utilise every anti-riot utterance of men like Nehru and counteract the openly communal policy of other leaders. Such utterances, acts and propaganda have some importance inasmuch as they enable us to expose more easily men like Patel who are nearest to feudal reaction.

Patel and Nehru

Not only on the question of riots but also on the question of democratic policies, there exist illusions about Nehru.

Nehru is seen as a fighter against Patel's policies and almost made to appear as the leader of the democratic forces. Every verbal opposition of Nehru to Patel is magnified. It is thus that an illusion is created that if Nehru's hands are strengthened as against Patel, the Government will be transformed into an instrument of the people's will.

This estimate of Nehru is anti-Marxist and serves to tie down the masses to the bourgeois leadership. It must be clearly understood that Nehru is as much a representative of the bourgeoisie as Patel is. They both defend the class policies and interests of the bourgeoisie which is now collaborating with imperialism.

Today, Nehru is following the same policy as Patel. It is so in the matter of foreign policy, of the States, of de-control, of industrial policy, etc. He often outdoes Patel on vital issues. He denounces strikes of the working class as a stab in the back.

In fact all shades of difference within the bourgeois camp (such as those between Nehru and Patel) are entirely subordinated to the new basic realignment of the class as a whole, namely its role of collaboration with imperialism. Both Nehru and Patel represent this collaborationist class, and all differences between them are being and will be solved within the fundamental framework of the collaborationist policy of

that class as a whole. The working class cannot go forward without fighting the policy of this class. That is why today it is anti-Marxist for the working class to base its strategy on "differences" within the bourgeois camp such as "Patel-Nehru" differences.

It is thus clear that the Central Government, manned by leaders of the National Congress, is the avowed enemy of the national democratic revolution. Marxism-Leninism has always taught that in the period of declining capitalism—of the general crisis of capitalism—the bourgeoisie cannot lead the democratic movement to victory, that it betrays it and goes over to the opposite camp, and that it is the working class which must lead it.

National Leaders and the Masses

We must remember that those in charge of the Government are still looked upon by the majority of the people as their leaders and the Government is still looked upon as a National Government in contrast to the previous imperialist Government.

The masses do not yet realise that the National Government is collaborating, that the country is being sold to Anglo-American imperialism, that the policies of the leadership are leading to riots, that the Government is being run in the interests of Big Business; they still believe it to be a freedom Government and are the victims of national sentiments and national illusions about the Congress leadership. The trusting masses of our country, though they are getting rapidly disillusioned with the National Government, have not yet lost their faith in Nehru, their faith in the Congress, and though repeatedly betrayed, they yet cling to old illusions.

Any criticism of the National Government which does not take into account these sentiments about it, is likely to defeat its purpose.

If in criticising the policies of the Government, we do not base ourselves on concrete instances, if we do not patiently argue on the basis of a series of such instances and bring the masses to the point at which

they can for themselves see the truth about our characterisation of the policies of the National Government; if we do not take into consideration the strong ties of loyalty that still bind the people to the Congress, our criticism will not impress the people and will not succeed in its aim of making them break away from their collaborating leaders.

At the same time, the rapid economic deterioration and disillusionment of the masses have created conditions for the successful unmasking of these reactionary policies—conditions which did not exist in the past.

To be able to move the masses into action for the fulfilment of the democratic aims, the working class must tear them away from the bourgeois leadership and build a new movement based on a new understanding of national unity.

IV. DEEPENING ECONOMIC CRISIS IN INDIA . . . THE CAPITALIST AND THE PEOPLE'S WAYS OUT

THE causes of the upsurge lie in the crisis of colonial economy, accentuated by wartime exploitation and post-war developments.

The main features of the crisis in India are:

1. Growing collapse of agrarian production because of feudal relations, and ruin of small-scale production;

2. The decline of industrial production from the middle of the war itself, in spite of favourable factors, showing the utter rottenness of the colonial order;

3. Accentuation of all the factors of colonial crisis by wartime inflation, which was the device of imperialism to transfer its war burdens to the people of India; and,

4. Following this, a still further polarisation of wealth and poverty in India, the masses of workers and peasants being forced to lower standards of life, or utter destitution.

The post-war upsurge continues because the exploiting classes, the bourgeoisie, the imperialists, the landlords and the feudal Princes, once more attempt to pass the burdens of the crisis on to the backs of the masses; because they seek to protect their profits in the face of decline in production; to protect their rights and interests in the face of deterioration of agriculture, at the expense of the workers and peasants, at the expense of middle classes. This leads to a sharpening of the economic struggle of the masses and develops it to a still higher stage—political struggle.

Collapse of Agrarian Economy

The colonial economy based upon feudal and semi-feudal landlordism had already started cracking long before the war. Agrarian revolution came on the agenda with the commencement of the world capitalist crisis in the year 1929, it became accentuated when the Second World War had broken out in 1939. By this time the outmoded land-relations had already become such a fetter on agricultural production that even the Royal Commission on Land Revenue was forced to recommend abolition of Permanent Zemindary Settlement with, of course, adequate compensation to the landlords.

But one decade of peasant struggles (1930-1940), bursting out at intervals in different parts of India, revealed that complete abolition of all forms of landlordism without any compensation and a redistribution of land to the tillers had become an urgent social need.

On top of this came the war economy which threw rural economy completely out of gear during the period of Second World War. The devastating Bengal Famine of 1943, the famines of Bihar, Orissa, Malabar and Andhra came as a rude reminder that the land system was collapsing very fast.

Imperialist war economy, namely inflation and high prices and acute scarcity of all essential goods, resulted in impoverishment of the toiling peasants to an unprecedented extent. The cost of agricultural production increased abnormally while the family budget of the poor and middle peasants became upset. Inflation, which increased the economic burden on the mass of the peasantry and was an imperialist device to pass the burdens of war on to the Indian masses, meant a rapid process of expropriation of the peasantry.

The landlords have taken full opportunity of the rack-rented peasants' misery and grabbed land to an ever-increasing extent. Small peasants' land passed into the hands of landlords whose monopoly hold over food stocks increased. The landlord became the principal food hoarder and the main source of blackmarketing in grains. The rich peasant also grew richer by

grabbing the poor peasants' land and selling surplus stocks in the blackmarket at abnormally high prices. The landlord, the rich peasant, the war contractor and the dealer together constituted the new village rich, the criminal blackmarketing gang.

As a result of these developments the number of the middle peasants dwindled and the poor and landless peasants have grown in number to an unprecedented scale. A small percentage of middle peasants has swollen the ranks of rich peasants. Disintegration of the middle peasantry is an outstanding fact of the new period.

Mass evictions of poor peasants by landlords and rich peasants intensified the new class differentiation in rural society. Small-peasant economy is thus passing through a deep crisis.

The burden on the middle and poor peasants and other semi-proletarians of the village was much more than the Rs. 1,600 crores taken by Britain in the shape of Sterling Balances. For, apart from this, the blackmarketeers and speculators netted crores from the peasantry.

The end of the war, therefore, saw the sharp polarisation of the classes and intensified class antagonism in the villages. The middle, poor and landless peasants began militant struggles, as in 1946, against the new village rich, the landlords and the prosperous peasants.

Agrarian economy, under the control of the new village rich, the food hoarders and land grabbers, is already on the brink of a precipice. The parasitic landlords, rich peasants and other blackmarketeers have been ruining agriculture; while the poor peasant is to toil, the parasites are only to grab. Agricultural production is therefore deteriorating very fast, famine has become a normal phenomenon.

This meant, on the one hand, peasants' fights against land-relations and big mass struggles. It, at the same time, meant the accentuation of the contradiction involved in a capitalist development of the colonies. It meant a narrowing of the market for

capitalist goods—the peasant becoming less and less of a buyer.

Every step forward in establishing capitalist relations, in the advance of large-scale industry, transport, etc., was accompanied by growing impoverishment of the peasantry and a consequent narrowing down of the market.

Both the imperialists and the national bourgeoisie relied on the vast millions to be their market. Both found that with their method of exploitation the market must go on narrowing.

The contradiction involved in capitalism itself narrowing its market was stated by Engels:

> "For it is one of the necessary corollaries of *grande industrie* that it *destroys* its own home market by the process by which it *creates* it. It creates it by destroying the basis of the domestic industry of the peasantry. But without domestic industry the peasantry cannot live. They are ruined as peasants; their purchasing power is reduced to a minimum; and until they, as *proletarians*, have settled down into new conditions of existence, they will furnish a very poor market for the newly arisen factories." (Letter of Engels to Danielson, p. 439, *Marx-Engels Correspondence*, National Book Agency, Calcutta.)

In India not only was the peasant's domestic industry destroyed but he was deprived of his land also. Hence the maintenance of feudal relations meant a continuous narrowing of the market.

All these contradictions have burst forth with great force during and after the war.

The predatory method of war finance—inflation—has accentuated all these contradictions and brought Indian agriculture to a collapsing point.

The deepening world crisis of capitalism will hit the toiling peasants most. The prices of agricultural commodities will fall faster than that of industrial goods, and the process of large-scale expropriation of the toiling peasants will be quickened still further.

All these will set in motion colossal class forces, the toiling peasants and rural artisans will pass on to the offensive against landlordism and the imperialist-bourgeois-feudal State to overthrow the colonial social order. Abolition of all forms of landlordism and all land to the tillers is the battle-cry of the fighting toiling peasants.

The agrarian areas of India have become a huge volcano which has started erupting every now and then. The desperation of the peasant is seen in the great Tebhaga struggle of Bengal, the Telengana struggle of the Nizam's Dominion, the struggle of the aboriginal Warlis of Bombay, the great struggles of the peasants of Bihar for *bakasht* land and the militant kisan struggles in Malabar and Tamilnad.

Out of the several un-coordinated struggles is coming forth the single demand: "Abolition of all forms of landlordism, land to the tillers." All ways lead to the agrarian revolution.

Industry and War

The imperialist policy towards industry during the war, together with the impoverishment of the peasantry, now determines the character of the industrial crisis.

Following its usual policy of obstructing industrial development, imperialism did not permit any expansion of industries during the war, afraid that such industry might compete with the industry at home. While in the USA the means of production increased by 50 per cent and in Britain they increased by 25 per cent, in India there was no increase whatsoever.

Imperialism also prevented machinery for replacement coming to India. Wartime industrial production was mainly increased by multiple shifts and not by adding to the means of production. There was hardly any new avenue of employment opened out for the Indian people.

Industry would have collapsed during the war period because of the narrow peasant market. In fact,

industrial production did start falling during the war itself, in spite of the most favourable circumstances. Had the war not come, industrial production might have totally collapsed.

Indian industry sustained itself during the war on the basis of huge Government orders. Government orders were worth Rs. 28 crores in 1939-40 and by 1942-43 they rose to Rs. 247 crores. In 1944-45 itself they were 145 crores.

The military took 54 million yards of cloth in 1939; 211 millions in 1940; 372 millions in 1941; 852 millions in 1942; 601 millions in 1943; 802 millions in 1944, and 575 millions in 1945.

Out of a total production of cement of 17,33,,000 tons in 1939-40, the military took 8,74,000 tons; in 1940, out of a total production of 17,27,000 tons it took 10,39,000 tons, and so on.

Thus in 1940 it bought nearly 60 per cent of the total production of cement while in 1942 nearly 90 per cent.

This enormous and steady market ensured by Government orders had a double advantage. On the one hand, the market for goods was assured; on the other hand, Government orders, by creating scarcity for civilian consumption, sent prices rocketing high and enabled the employers to garner huge profits.

The prices of all industrial commodities rose enormously, except in one or two cases.

The cloth-price index rose from 100 in 1939-40 to 442 in 1943-44 and remained at 262 in 1946-47.

The coal-price index rose from 100 in 1939 to 174 in 1943, 282 in 1944 and 304 in 1945.

Pig iron rose from 100 in 1939 to 117 (controlled) in 1944 and subsequent years.

Jute rose from 100 in 1939 to 238 in 1943, 270 in 1944, 251 in 1945.

Obviously industry would have had no chance with this rise in prices at a time when the market was getting impoverished and the mass of the peasantry was getting pauperised.

The price structure of industrial goods was totally

at variance with the purchasing power of the people.

But industry continued because of the huge Government orders which offered a stable market.

Secondly, it sustained itself on those sections of the people which had grown rich during the war, or those which had a greater purchasing power, etc.—a small and narrow section—but which offered enough market to take a good part of what was left by the military or the Government.

The question of the market was thus temporarily solved, in spite of the impoverishment of the masses.

But with the close of the war and the falling off of Government orders, the problem of market once more faces the industry.

First, the fact that new industries are not being built, the fact that erection of new factories is not yet taking place, is an important factor in the narrowing of the market. It follows logically from the imperialist policy of denying any capital goods to India till a deal is put through. It follows from the very colonial status of India.

Secondly, when all these goods have to be consumed by the people, directly or indirectly industry comes up against a pauperised people, whose purchasing power has been drastically limited or destroyed, and who can no longer buy the products of the industry.

The wartime market, composed of the rich and upper-middle class strata, etc., is no longer sufficient, since now the question is of selling the entire production and not only that part left by the military.

The same process which accumulated an enormous quantity of capital in the hands of the capitalists, has destroyed their market. Inflation and wartime exploitation robbed the masses of their capacity to pay *not only* the imperialist masters but also the Indian capitalists, and have led to the killing of the market on a large scale. It is this contradiction which the capitalists have to solve if their industries are to move.

But the close of the war has intensified the market crisis. Apart from the peasantry, etc., other sections are also being deprived of this purchasing power. The clerical staff of the Government, the extra staff drafted

for war purposes, the soldiers of the army and other branches of defence, men from Ordnance Depots, Government transports, railways, docks, etc., tens of thousands who represented some purchasing power are being thrown out of jobs, thus intensifying the crisis of the market.

It is already reported that nearly half a million soldiers are demobilised; several thousands of Government servants are being retrenched from all departments.

This, of course, means that the market will not be able to absorb the same quantity of production—goods will be surplus and remain unsold, and production will decline. This in its turn results in closing down of factories, in workers being thrown out of jobs, reduction in wages, etc.—thus causing a still further decline in the purchasing power of the people, and narrowing the market.

Already industrial production was declining in the midst of the war itself. Coal rose from 27 million tons in 1939 to 29 million tons in 1942 and then dropped to 25 million tons in 1943, 26 millions in 1944 and had not yet come to the 1942 level in 1945.

Pig iron dropped from two million tons in 1941 to 1.4 million tons in 1945—a decline of nearly 20 per cent over 1939-40. Jute manufactures dropped from 1.2 million tons in 1941 to one million tons in 1943 and 1.1 million tons in 1945. Cloth production rose from 4,012 million yards in 1939-40 to 4,871 million yards in 1943-44—a figure which is vitiated by the bogus standard-cloth production—and then declined to 4,676 million yards in 1945-46, and is said to be near the pre-war figure now.

No doubt part of the decline is due to want of replacement of old machinery; part is also due to concealment of figures for purposes of blackmarket transactions. But, nonetheless, there is a real decline, and that is seen from the fact that in these years industrial stoppages increased involving loss of millions of working days.

The increasing strike wave, specially in 1945-46

and 1946-47, was the outcome of the resistance of the capitalists to working-class demands, of the attempt to pass additional burdens on it, in their desperation to lower the costs of production at the expense of the workers, so that the market should expand and not narrow down. It was a recognition on the part of the capitalists that, with existing prices, the market would shrink continuously. But intent on keeping the old profits, they began to apply the axe on workers' incomes and brought about stoppages of production. The decline of production was thus directly due to the capitalist way of securing a market which was rapidly contracting.

The paradox of declining production when there is shortage of goods must properly be understood.

The process of impoverishment of the masses has gone to such an extreme limit that today they are left with hardly any purchasing power to buy the goods produced at the existing high prices. With the cancellation of Government orders, large quantities of goods are now thrown on the regular market. In terms of the needs of the people, they are not enough. But in relation to the prices—legal and blackmarket—charged for them, they are beyond the means of the people.

Ordinarily this would have expressed itself as over-production, with goods remaining unsold and workers losing their jobs. But the prevailing inflation and the depreciated purchasing power in the hands of many creates an illusion that it is all a question of shortage only; that people have got enough purchasing power to buy, only the goods are not there in sufficient quantity.

In reality, the present shortage of goods is only the reverse side of the process of impoverishment through inflation. Inflation, which robbed India of goods worth millions of rupees during the war years, was also an instrument of effecting a forcible redistribution of the national dividend among India's various classes. It made the rich richer and the poor poorer. While it enriched enormously the capitalists and put large sums of money in the hands of certain other

selected groups — top professionals, high Government officials, upper-middle class people—it decisively impoverished the bulk of the people, thus limiting their capacity to buy.

It is these latter people, the vast majority of Indians, who suffer from shortage because they cannot afford to buy the goods at the existing high rates. The former, the rich, create the illusion of prosperity, of infinite purchasing power, ready to buy everything, and form the main customers of the blackmarkets as well as of open markets.

Merchants and traders continue to buy large quantities for purposes of speculation and blackmarket, hoping that they would be able to dispose them of in a short time. They want to get rid of the depreciating money and buy commodities which go on appreciating under conditions of inflation. The investments in commodity seem to be the safest, since every day they go on appreciating in value. The blackmarket prices are so lucrative that the merchant is assured of good profits even if he sells only a part of his goods. Everyone knows that there are always large stocks in the blackmarket which are not disposed of and yet the blackmarket thrives.

But if the existing price levels continue, a saturating point will soon be reached in the blackmarket; merchants and traders will find that the hope of disposing of the blackmarket stocks is not to be fulfilled and the brisk sales, which go on today because everyone believes that there is shortage and infinite demand for goods, will stop. The truth will be out that there are not too little but too many goods at the existing level of prices.

Inflation and speculation, arising from it, conceal the real nature of the crisis of which a warning is already given by the decline in production.

The policy of de-control embarked upon by the Government means that the bourgeoisie has already recognised that the blackmarket has reached a saturation point; that at the level of blackmarket prices, goods cannot be sold in large quantities.

De-control, therefore, is a device to widen the market in a special way—prices will fall compared with the blackmarket rates but will rise compared with the control rates. It is an effort to reach a wider section of well-placed people, while keeping out the large mass as before. It is a device to distribute goods according to means and remove all barriers in the way of selling in the best possible market to the upper strata of the population in as large a quantity as possible.

Thus, the profit-motive of the capitalists intensifies the crisis at every step. They must keep prices high in order to make huge profits. But these prices are at variance with the purchasing power of the bulk of the people—which means that the needs of the latter will not be satisfied and the goods of the capitalists will remain unsold. The profit-greed of the capitalists has driven the workers to desperation; it is keeping goods out of the reach of the common man, and, in its search for profitable markets, causing a collapse of production.

The crisis thus arises from the imperialist loot of the war period, from the imperialist obstruction to industrial development, from the redistribution of the national income through inflation, from the profit-hunt of the capitalists, and from the colonial character of India's agricultural relations.

How do the capitalists and the National Government seek a way out of this crisis? What are their plans of avoiding a decline in production?

Their plans lie within the framework of colonial economy, of imperialist economy.

Afraid of the masses and their initiative, afraid to interfere with property rights and thus create a precedent for interference in capitalist property, especially in the context of the growing demand for nationalisation of industries—the Indian capitalist class and the National Government are opposed to the liquidation of the old feudal order, which alone will release the peasant masses from the yoke of feudalism and stop the process of impoverishment.

The release from feudalism will make the peasant a good customer, a good market, but the social conse-

quences of the step, they fear, will be such that the people might march forward and take charge of the entire national economy, dethroning the bourgeoisie from its privileged position.

That is why, both politically and economically, the bourgeoisie compromised with imperialism and the feudal-landlord bloc.

The economic collaboration with landlords expresses itself in the so-called land bills which retain landlordism in one form or another and thus ruin all chances of expanding the market among the vast bulk of the peasantry. The agrarian bills of the Congress Ministries with their insistence on compensation, with no provision for land to the tiller, with at best some concessions to the richer upper strata of the peasantry, keep the old land-relations intact and impoverishment on the increase.

In these most favourable circumstances, the market is somewhat extended only among the upper section of the peasants who are granted concessions and get new opportunities of grabbing land from the poor peasants. If the rights of the landlords are somewhere touched, it is only in order to help a section below them—a wider section—but not to give relief to the mass of the peasantry.

For the rest, the National Government and the bourgeoisie hope to save Indian agriculture by means of extension of irrigation facilities, manure, hydro-electric dams, of bringing new land under cultivation—all the old familiar schemes of imperialism which seek to achieve a miracle in agrarian conditions without changing the pre-capitalist land-relations.

The hope that through these a prosperous, middle, independent peasantry will be stabilised—with feudal relations dominating land—is a fond hope doomed to failure.

The national bourgeoisie, therefore, in its compromise with imperialism and feudalism, has set its face against revolutionary changes in agrarian relations, thereby announcing its bankruptcy to raise either the standard of living of the peasant or the production on land. It is thus incapable of utilising the vast potential

market that exists, and organise the rapid industrialisation of India. That is why there can hardly be any genuine industrial development of India on capitalist lines, ending her colonial character. At every step the attempts to develop on capitalist lines come in conflict with the capitalist collaboration with the imperialist-feudal combine, which destroys the market and hampers industrial growth.

In the post-war crisis, therefore, the capitalists and the National Government do not have any plan of getting out of the crisis except one of maintaining the old order on the basis of repression and force. For the vast masses of India, the rural millions, they offer nothing except feudal and landlord tyranny, sanctified now by the bourgeoisie in its base compromise with imperialism; they offer nothing except the upholding of the old imperialist order which kept India backward on the basis of pre-capitalist relations in agriculture.

Fear of the agrarian revolution, arising out of the fear of a political revolution, forces the bourgeoisie to solve the crisis within the framework of the imperialist-colonial order and thus get into an insoluble contradiction. On this basis, therefore, not only expansion of industries is not possible but even retention of the present production level is becoming impossible.

How then do the bourgeoisie and the National Government attempt to solve the crisis on the industrial front? Having decided to keep the large masses of people in poverty, the only hope for production is to produce with sweated labour, low wage-costs, and intensification of the labour process.

The bourgeoisie and the National Government thus attempt to find a way out of the crisis by brutally lowering wage-costs, attacking the workers in all directions, demanding a restoration of the nine-hour day, stopping all further wage concessions, and attacking the wage standards of the working class, introducing rationalisation and retrenchment where possible, so that wage-costs are reduced. They attempt to bring production near to the impoverished people by impoverishing the workers as well, and thus accentuating the crisis.

The capitalist way thus means misery for the peasant, misery for the worker, misery for the middle class, and, in the bargain, an all-round decline in production.

The bourgeoisie starts by raising the cry about shortage of production and then concentrates fire on the working-class strikes. Its demand is that the working class should tamely submit to wage-cuts, etc., to guarantee capitalist profits and enable the capitalists to secure markets at the expense of the working class. To this end, the National Government and the Congress Ministries introduce anti-strike legislation and suppress the workers' resistance to facilitate the capitalist offensive.

The capitalists and the National Government are moving towards an attack on the eight-hour day so that the employers get one hour's labour without much extra cost and are able to reduce costs and make profits.

The National Government helps the capitalists in their rationalisation of industries, no wage legislation, complete freedom for them to deal with labour, and pass on the burden of the crisis to the workers.

All this, by reducing the purchasing power of the people, intensifies the crisis instead of solving it.

But, nonetheless, for the capitalists there is no way out. They must forcibly make the workers accept low wage standards and suppress them to keep production going. They must also keep the peasantry enslaved.

Naturally, in these circumstances, the Indian capitalists look to foreign markets for absorbing their goods which the Indian market cannot absorb because of the poverty of the people. They are looking more and more to the foreign markets not only for an outlet for present surplus goods, but also for exporting goods of the industries which they hope to build in the near future.

The collapse of the Indian market makes the capitalists more dependent on foreign markets which only America and Britain can offer.

This leads to two results:

First, it means further intensification of attacks

against labour to increase the competitive capacity of the Indian industry in foreign markets.

Secondly, it leads to deals with foreign capitalists, to allow them the right of joint exploitation of the Indian market, joint investment in return for exports and supply of capital goods. This means guarantees about no nationalisation of industries, of return on capital and of putting down labour firmly. It also means acceptance of only such industrial expansion as is permitted either by Britain or America, and, for the rest, retention of the old colonial order. All talk of planning, prosperity, abolition of Indian poverty, etc., disappears with this policy, this attempt to get out of the crisis.

That is why the National Government no longer talks about planning; that is why it has given an assurance to the capitalists in the Industries Conference that at least for five years to come there will be no nationalisation; that is why it is passing anti-strike legislation and enabling the employers to pass on the burdens of the crisis to the workers and the people. That is why it has removed controls to enable the capitalists to make profits.

The conditions attaching to the export of Indian goods abroad are such that exports will not solve the crisis but intensify it at every step and Indian collaboration with Britain and America will only intensify the misery of the people, ruining both industry and agriculture.

The capitalist way, therefore, is opposed on all fronts by the people, by the workers, by the peasants, by the students and by the middle class.

As against the capitalist plan of retaining Indian misery by retaining the existing land-relations, by attacking wage standards, forcing prolongation of the working hours, demanding higher prices for goods or de-control, demanding uncontrolled profits and opposing nationalisation, attacking trade unions and strikes and suppressing workers and peasants, demanding mass retrenchment and rationalisation, the needs of the people demand planning in economic life based on the abolition of landlordism and land to the tiller, nationalisa-

tion of key and vital industries with workers' control over them, nationalisation of banks; living wage, trade union recognition, right to strike, and social security to workers; living wage for middle-class employees, security of service and pension; control of profits; confiscation of British capital, etc.

This way alone the contradiction between production and a narrowing market can be solved, a contradiction arising solely out of the capitalist character of production.

On the basis of these, the people can plan ahead, organise production for the needs of the people, increase it by common efforts for common good and distribute it on the basis of labour performed—so that a planned properous economy is possible for the people.

The two ways out of the crisis are diametrically opposed.

The capitalist way is that of safeguarding profits by intensifying the misery of the people, of guarding the old colonial order in collaboration with imperialism, and of perpetuating and intensifying Indian misery; while the workers' and the people's way is to solve the crisis by uprooting the root cause—the colonial order—with its imperialist-feudal-bourgeois exploitation. The capitalists can only attain their objective by suppressing the people, defeating the workers' and peasants' movements and establishing a naked dictatorship of force, i.e., by suppressing the political liberties of the people. The capitalist way is not only one of economic misery but of political suppression and slavery.

That is why the working class and other toiling people must defeat the capitalist policy and successfully solve the crisis in the interests of the people. This means that they must defeat the capitalist-landlord offensive and the policies which help them and see to it that their movement is not terrorised by force.

In the partial struggles, strikes, political conflict, these two ways face each other. The capitalist way drives the masses to accept the challenge every day, makes their condition unbearable and unleashes the upsurge all round.

V. *AGAINST IMPERIALIST-BOURGEOIS CONSPIRACY FORGE A NEW CLASS ALLIANCE ... .PROGRAMME OF DEMOCRATIC FRONT*

Masses Fight Back

THE establishment of the Congress Ministries and subsequently of the National Government, the communal offensive launched by reaction, and the disruptive role played by the Congress have not diminished the post-war upsurge. Its causes lie deeper than the mere formation of Government, for, they directly follow from the exploitation of the Indian masses which has reached unbearable proportions.

Though the Congress leaders in the beginning were successful in creating new hope among the people that things could be remedied through the National Government, the process of disillusionment has been quickened since August 15, and the upsurge is asserting itself more and more. Through their common fights and day-to-day struggles, through their cooperation for their demands, all these sections more and more come to realise that their poverty and exploitation can be ended only by a triumph of the democratic movement. Never was there so much understanding of the main slogans of the democratic movement: abolition of landlordism and land to the tiller; abolition of autocracy; nationalisation of key industries and a living wage as the cornerstone of any stable life for the people.

But today the people in their disillusionment are learning something more, and that is, that a Government manned by leaders in whom they had utmost faith cannot discharge a single responsibility and cannot give them either land, peace or bread. More and more the people are coming to the conclusion that the National Government is guided by the vested interests;

more and more they are seeing the link between the Indian capitalists and the national leaders. Out of this disillusionment will come the demand for another Government, and it is the duty of the Communist Party to consciously guide the people in fighting for that demand boldly and decisively.

The programme of the democratic movement can be implemented only when the State power belongs to classes which are interested in full democracy and from which all opponents of democracy are excluded. Such a State will be based on the alliance of workers, peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie, under the leadership of the working class. It will be a People's Democratic State based on the alliance of anti-imperialist classes, workers, peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie, under the leadership of the working class, and from which all collaborationists and exploiting elements are excluded. It will be based upon direct rule of the toiling people in place of the present bureaucratic system.

The existing correlation of forces, in which every step forward of the popular struggle is to be taken not only in opposition to imperialism but in opposition to the bourgeoisie also, clearly shows that the old phase of the bourgeois democratic revolution is over, a phase in which the bourgeoisie was in the anti-imperialist camp. Today the entire trend of events demands a democratic State of workers, toiling peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie as the only rallying slogan to surge forward to the defeat of imperialism and its bourgeois allies, and emancipation of the people. It means that People's Democratic Revolution has to be achieved for the completion of the tasks of democratic revolution and the simultaneous building up of Socialism. This can be assured by establishing firmly the leadership of the working class over the other sections of the toiling people.

New Class Alliance

To defeat the bourgeois-imperialist conspiracy, to defeat the combine of imperialism, feudalism and the

bourgeoisie, it is necessary to marshal the forces of the revolutionary people in a new way, that is, to forge a new alliance of all the classes for whom the success of the democratic revolution is vital. The democratic State cannot be realised without such an alliance and unity of the people.

The spontaneous movement of the workers, peasants and middle classes against economic exploitation and political repression itself gives the form of the new front. It is the duty of the working class and the Communist Party to combine this growing upsurge into a new Democratic Front reflecting the unity of the fighting masses. The basis of this new Democratic Front is the common struggle against exploitation and political subjection. The Front will, therefore, include the fighting masses and all those fighting organisations which help it to go forward against the treacherous policy of the national bourgeoisie and the designs of imperialism.

The Communist Party, the working class and the mass organisations led by the Communist Party will be the core of this Front. The militant following of the Left parties and all genuine Leftists in these parties will be important partners in the Front. The Front will grow by drawing inside it the entire fighting masses as well as the anti-imperialist following of the Congress and the League so that the broadest unity of the common people can be built in the struggle for freedom and democracy.

It must be clearly understood that though the Front will include several political parties, trade unions, kisan sabhas, student and youth organisations and other bodies, it will not be a mere coalition of several organisations. On the contrary, it must become the genuine fighting alliance of the masses against imperialism, feudalism and the bourgeoisie.

For building such a Front the Communists shall seek the cooperation of all Left parties and elements. They will strive to establish unity of action with Left parties. But the cardinal thing for the Communists to remember is that the struggle for building the Demo-

cratic Front is inseparable from the struggle to establish working-class hegemony, that is, to win the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie for the fighting programme and policy of the working class.

It must also be stressed that in course of its development the Democratic Front will have to be directed, through persistent struggle for a common programme and progressive realisation of working-class leadership, towards a disciplined and firmly united mass political organisation functioning democratically and based solidly on the unity of the people.

The Democratic Front, therefore, must not be looked upon as an organisation representing a top alliance between Left parties. It is a Front based on the masses. It is an alliance between the working class, the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia. This Front becomes strong and capable of decisive action to the extent that it becomes unified both politically and organisationally under working-class leadership, to the extent that the working class secures the confidence of its allies and is able to win them for its programme and policy.

Unless the Communists realise all this, there is every danger of repeating the mistakes of the past, of Right opportunism masquerading as Left unity, and making the working class trail behind the vacillating class.

Under the impact of the crisis and as the result of growing disillusionment with the Government, larger and larger sections of masses will be set in motion. The process of radicalisation will be hastened even among the most backward strata. It will be the task of the Democratic Front to draw all these sections in the common movement, forge the fighting alliance of the people, coordinate and integrate the various partial struggles and develop them as part of the fight for the ending of imperialist-feudal-bourgeois domination. Only under the firm guidance of the working class and only by developing as the united mass organisation of the fighting people, the Democratic Front can carry out these tasks.

United Front with Left Parties

The United Front of Left parties in the present situation will be a powerful lever to build the new Front, disillusioning and activising the Congress and League masses, the States' peoples and other sections, and in building a united movement for the democratic revolution.

The independent strength of the Communist Party of India and the general leftward swing of the people enhances immensely the strength of Left forces and makes them the base and spearhead of the new unity.

The Communist Party must, therefore, seek immediate agreements with Left parties for joint action, for common understanding of the problems of the democratic movement and for building a front against the compromisers and their real masters. At the same time, the Party must note that discredited and dishonest elements and groups sometimes come forward as a Left force, exploiting the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist anger of the masses. The Party must expose and fight such groups, especially groups having connection with organisations or professing policies which are internationally accepted as counter-revolutionary.

The building of the Democratic Front is a process of struggle. It advances through a series of joint campaigns and partial struggles, jointly conducted, and through local united fronts between the Party and the local Congress and League masses—even Committees wherever possible—between the Left parties and the Congress and League masses at other places, between the Party and other mass organisations in still other places. The fundamental basis, however, is the independent activity of the proletarian party and its capacity to lead struggles of the masses and draw new masses into the fighting arena. The core of the new Front would be the Communist Party together with the mass organisations led by the Party, trade unions, kisan sabhas and students' and youth organisations. Round this must be gathered the militant following of the Left parties, vast masses from the Congress, the League, the States Praja Mandals, etc., so that a broad Democratic Front takes shape to meet the new situation.

In many provinces organised Left groups do not exist. There are thousands of unattached Leftists in all provinces. Unity of the Left parties is a weapon of drawing these thousands into the common front for joint action. In the South we must devote special attention to the unorganised Left; for Left unity will mean drawing these unattached thousands into the common fight. In other provinces also, Left unity ought to be an instrument of attracting unorganised Leftists who will now find an effective platform and instrument for implementing their Left aspirations. It will also attract other progressive Congressmen on specific issues.

Congress, League and the Democratic Front

The relation of the Congress and the League to the Democratic Front must be properly understood.

Both these organisations command the loyalty of lakhs of people, of vast sections of the anti-imperialist masses. Desperate attempts will be made by the leaderships of these two organisations to keep these masses away from the struggle for the democratic revolution and from the Democratic Front by exploiting old loyalties and the memories of the anti-imperialist struggles. The forces of the democratic movement will be weak and paralysed if the bourgeois leaderships succeed in keeping the masses under the influence of these organisations away from the Democratic Front.

The Communist Party must devote the utmost attention to winning these masses away from the influence of the bourgeois leaders, through propaganda, joint campaigns and joint struggles.

Great and vital importance, therefore, attaches to bringing the masses of these two organisations inside the Democratic Front, in opposition to their leaders. It is, therefore, essential that the Leftists who are associated with these organisations should carry on a persistent battle, both inside and outside these organisations, to unmask the policies of the leaderships and win over the masses for the democratic revolution and for joining the Democratic Front.

The Congress with its sixty-year-old tradition of anti-British fight, and with the memories of national battles that it rouses, sways lakhs of anti-imperialists who earnestly desire to move forward. The name of the Congress is today used by the bourgeois leaders to keep popular opinion behind them in support of their collaborationist policy. What the people are unable to accept from the Central Government and the Provincial Ministries, is pushed through the Congress and public criticism is paralysed.

To abandon the fight for the Congress masses, to ignore their important role in the Democratic Front, will be tantamount to making a present of lakhs of people to the bourgeois leaders. Every attempt must be made to win over the Congress masses, to carry the fight against the bourgeois leadership right inside the Congress organisation itself on every burning issue. The Congress leadership, however, will neither accept the programme of the Democratic Front nor come into the Front, because it represents the bourgeoisie as a class and that class has gone collaborationist. But it is vital to win the Congress masses for the democratic movement. The Communist Party, therefore, attaches great importance to the work of consistent anti-imperialists and democrats inside the Congress, the work of disillusioning the masses and pressing forward for a democratic programme.

The Socialist Party

The Communist Party of India must take into consideration both the importance of the United Front of the Left and its limitations.

Under the stress of the crisis and the militancy of the masses, under the stress of the August struggle and disillusionment of large sections of Congressmen with the right-wing leadership, Left-minded elements strongly opposed to the capitalists are drawn to the Socialist Party. In places like Bombay, the Socialist Party has also a working-class base. In places like Calcutta, it counts among its members old trade union leaders. It has got a large number of honest elements

in its ranks who seek to work among the kisans, workers, students, to build mass organisations.

The right-wing Congress leadership itself is afraid of the Socialist Party and at the same time wants to woo it.

The strength of the Socialist Party comes from the ranks who are overwhelmingly drawn from the petty bourgeoisie. The ranks hate the capitalists, are dissatisfied with the Nehru Government and the compromise, and want to move forward. They consider themselves Socialists; in fact they are Left nationalists. Nonetheless, their urge for Socialism is real and though they are kept away from it by the misleading policies of their leadership, they constitute a current orientating towards the proletariat.

The building up of the United Front of the Left involves the winning over of their ranks for the common task of pushing forward the democratic revolution and establishing a democratic State.

But the aspirations and the orientations of the Left ranks must be separated from the leadership and the programme of the Socialist Party. The ranks are being poisoned by the anti-working-class theories and formulations of the Socialist leadership, are given a distorted idea about Socialism and the international situation and are continually poisoned against the Communist Party and the revolutionary movement. Sharp exposure of the "Socialism" of the Socialist leaders, their theoretical presumptions, their anti-Soviet and anti-Communist line, and their stand on Indian questions is an integral part of the struggle to build the United Front of the Left.

In exposing the Socialist leadership it must be remembered that the leadership, barring the four or five at the top, has no uniform policy. In such cases a differentiated approach should be made.

The programme and policy laid down by the top leaders of the Socialist Party, including Jaiprakash Narain, Achyut Patwardhan, Ram Manohar Lohia and Ashok Mehta, clearly reveal that behind the talk of Socialism lurks the sinister design to exploit the Left discontent of the ranks to transform the Socialist Party

into a bourgeois constitutional party—His Majesty's constitutional Opposition, so to say. Both their international outlook and the national outlook reveal the same thing.

In its recent programme which is supposed to be a transitional programme to Socialism, the first stage in India's evolution towards Socialism, the party suggests a banal programme of administrative reforms, the high water-mark of its democracy not going beyond responsibility of the executive to the legislature. It requires an amazing boldness in these days to parade mere responsibility to the legislature as transitional steps to Socialism.

While the programme prattles about India being a republic, of expropriation of private property and enterprise "with or without compensation," it nowhere mentions struggle as being necessary for it. It pins its faith in constitutional opposition and acts as if the democratic revolution is already complete, the people are in power, and all that remains to be done is to take transitional steps to Socialism.

It openly preaches the illusion that Socialism may be achieved by constitutional means. It covers its advocacy of constitutionalism by calling it "democratic means."

In their demands for constitutional rights the Socialist leaders do not include the right of self-determination of national units like Andhra, Tamilnad, Maharashtra, and reveal that they have learnt nothing from recent Indian history.

In their economic programme they suggest the possibility of compensation before nationalising private property, and they do not necessarily demand immediate nationalisation of heavy industries. On the contrary, their demand is immediate or early nationalisation, thus seeking an excuse to postpone nationalisation.

They talk of abolition of landlordism, living wage, etc., but having given up all struggle to change the social order, not having the courage to demand nationalisation at least in their programme, everything else becomes just the words of a bourgeois leadership giving electoral promises.

On the concrete issues of day-to-day importance, the Socialist Party leaders adopt anti-popular policies, support de-control and help Big Business to exploit the people. They echo capitalist slanders about the working class not doing its duty, and help the bosses (Jaiprakash's letter to the Railway Board).

Forced by the ranks, they have to go in for strikes, but generally they oppose and even break strikes (strikes of drawers-in of Bombay textile mills and Ashok Mehta's admissions). They disrupt the unity of the Trade Union Congress and the trade union movement and help the bosses' offensive, though their ranks want unity.

They concentrate their fire on the Communist Party—the mass actions led by it—and shamelessly support repressive measures against it (Ashok Mehta's statement on the firing on Bombay students). Their members in the Legislature support black measures like the Public Safety Bill in Bengal and they oppose and break protest strikes against them.

They are strong opponents of Left unity, of any cooperation with the Communist Party. They thus perform a disruptive role in the interests of the collaborationists.

From time to time the Socialist leaders give it out that they are leaving the Congress. This is an attempt first of all to pacify the ranks with Left talk about secession from the Congress, for the ranks are fed up with the vacillating policies of their leadership and think that they are the inevitable consequences of remaining inside the Congress. The talk of leaving the Congress pleases the Left ranks, for, it opens before them prospects of independent and militant political activity in opposition to the compromising leadership of the Congress. The ranks hate the compromise and want to cut themselves off from the deadening grip of the policies of the Congress leadership and go in for an independent militant political line.

Nothing, however, is farther from the minds of the Socialist leaders. At present the talk about secession from the Congress only serves to keep their Left pres-

tige with their ranks, and also it is a weapon of bargaining with the Congress leadership.

When the leadership decides to leave the Congress, it will not do it to go in for an independent revolutionary line but when it finds that it can now play the role of an independent bourgeois Opposition party, a parliamentary party for the next elections. The talk about secession from the Congress in the mouth of Socialist leaders is only an advertisement of their future plan to contest elections independently under the new Constitution and try their luck at the ballot box. It is the result of their maturing into constitutional bourgeois leaders and has not an iota of revolution in it.

Their Statement of Policy reveals that they have drawn their theoretical understanding and appraisal of international events from the extreme right-wing Social Democrats of Europe and America.

They repeat the worst slanders about the Soviet Union, calling it a totalitarian State and making it plain that they are opposed to a real Socialist revolution.

In their foreign policy they follow the hypocritical Bevin in advocating a "third" group—which is only a cover to conceal their political alignment with American imperialism.

In their Statement of Policy they deliberately omit all reference to American imperialism, which means they will follow its dictates. Instead of concretely pointing out that a conflict does exist between the two camps—the camp of democracy and the camp of imperialism—they pose the conflict as being between Russia and the rest of the nations of UNO, thus screening American imperialism and its designs against democracy and freedom of all peoples and its conspiracy against the Socialist State.

And finally, by a trick of hand, they seek to do away with the main contradiction between capitalism and the working class by saying that the main contradiction is between advanced and backward countries—thus making a crude appeal to bourgeois nationalism and hiding the fact that the struggle of backward countries is part of the struggle for world Socialism and against the capitalist order.

This outlook enables them to say that a Socialist of backward countries must be an assertive nationalist, i.e., it draws and lends justification to any cooperation with any imperialist power in the name of nationalism.

The leadership of the Socialist Party is attempting to transform it into a collaborationist party behind the facade of Socialist phrases.

It must be ideologically unmasked and fought, and the ranks must be taught to see it in its real colours.

The ranks themselves do not accept this programme wholly. The Socialist Party is not a unified party but a heterogeneous combination. In winning over the ranks these points must be noted.

Nonetheless, a merciless ideological struggle must be carried on against the leadership. The ranks must be won over on the basis of Marxism, which a large section accepts, and on the basis of concrete issues, but we should have no illusions that the top leaders will ever agree to a joint front unless the ranks do it over their heads or press them to do it.

Programme of the Democratic Revolution

The programme of the Democratic Front and the Left parties should contain the following:

(1) Complete severance from the British Empire and full and real independence.

(2) A democratic Government representing the workers, toiling peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie, opposed to collaboration with Anglo-American imperialism, allied to the democratic States working for peace and freedom of all nations.

(3) A Constitution based on adult suffrage and proportional representation, guaranteeing full freedom and democracy to the common man and fundamental economic rights.

(4) Self-determination to nationalities, including the right of secession. A voluntary Indian Union, autonomous linguistic provinces.

(5) Just and democratic rights of minorities to be embodied in the Constitution: Equality and protection

to the language and culture of minorities, all liabilities, privileges and discriminations on caste, race and community to be abolished by law, and their infringements to be punishable by law.

(6) Abolition of Princedom and feudal rule in the Indian States and the establishment of full democracy. On the question of accession, exposure of the policies of the Governments of both India and Pakistan of parading accession to the Indian Union or Pakistan as a big triumph, and explanation to the common people that the urgent and primary task inside the States is the abolition of Princedom and feudal rule and the establishment of a people's democratic State. Accession before that is only slavery of the States' people, both to Princely autocracy and to the bourgeois rulers of the Indian Union. It is only after the people of the States become completely free that they will have real liberty to decide the question of accession. At that stage the question will be decided by the wishes of the people.

(7) Freedom of the tribal and such other backward peoples from economic, cultural and political oppression, extension of full democratic rights to them, prompt and adequate State aid for their development, so that they may rapidly catch up with the advanced nationalities. The people of all contiguous, compact, predominantly tribal areas shall have regional autonomy. They may form autonomous areas within the provinces, enjoying full powers regarding general administration within the areas and specially regarding economic and cultural matters of regional importance. The people of such areas, in suitable cases, may also form separate province or provinces. The people of such areas or provinces shall have the right to secede from the State by a democratic verdict.

(8) Cooperation between the Indian Union and Pakistan for mutual economic aid in the interest of the toiling people, military and political alliance against imperialist intervention and foreign aggression, democratic foreign policy in cooperation with democratic States against Anglo-American bloc.

(9) Abolition of landlordism without compensation and distribution of land to the tillers of the soil. Abolition of the zemindary system must mean confiscation of *khas* lands of the non-cultivating landowners, and ensure land to sub-tenants and share-croppers. Liquidation of rural indebtedness and abolition of usury. Living wage for the agricultural labourers.

(10) Confiscation by the State of interests of foreign capital in banks, industrial and transport concerns, plantations, mines, etc., and nationalisation of these concerns.

(11) Nationalisation of big industries, big banks and insurance companies, guarantee of workers' control, minimum living wage, eight-hour day, etc.

(12) Economic plan to develop India's resources and removal of Big Business from strategic economic points. Control of profits in the industries in private hands.

(13) Repeal of all repressive legislation.

(14) Elimination of the bureaucratic administrative State apparatus and the establishment of a democratic administration with elected officials, guided by people's committees.

(15) General arming of the people and the establishment of a people's democratic army.

(16) The right to free education and compulsory primary education.

(17) Equal democratic rights to women.

The Democratic Front, and the Communist Party in building it up, will fight communal reactionaries, riot-mongers and protagonists of war between the Indian Union and Pakistan as enemies of the people. They will organise *Shanti Senas*, cooperate with all who stand for communal peace, and, in order to quell riots, will make use of every anti-riot measure of the Government. At the same time, they will expose the policy of national compromise which spreads riots and will call upon the people to defeat the game of the vested interests. They will also expose all communal acts

of the members of the Government which abet feudal reaction.

To start with, it is not necessary that there should be a joint front of only those who agree with the entire programme of the Democratic Front. Immediate joint actions may start on specific questions. As joint actions develop and as Left cooperation develops, the correctness of the programme will be self-evident to all democratic elements, and the Front will be progressively realised as part of the experience of the Left and the masses as a whole.

VI. TASKS OF THE PARTY IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

THE aim of the People's Democratic Revolution is to bring about those fundamental changes in our political and social structure, without which there can be no freedom and no prosperity for our common people. The present State will be replaced by a People's Democratic Republic—a republic of workers, peasants and oppressed middle classes. The bureaucratic administratrion will be dissolved and will be replaced by officials elected by the people, controlled by their committees and subject to recall. Landlordism will be abolished and land given to the tillers. All big banks and factories will be taken over by the State and run in the interest of the people and not for the profits of the few. Princely autocracy will be ended and the States' people freed from feudal and capitalist shackles.

On the basis of these changes the foundation will be laid for the building up of a Socialist economy, for the ensuring of a happy and prosperous life for our people.

It will be the task of the Communist Party to work untiringly for these aims and to make this perspective the perspective of the entire democratic movement. It will be the task of the Party to conduct and lead all struggles of workers, peasants and other toilers in such a manner as to develop them as part of a single movement for the realisation of this programme.

Tasks on the Trade Union Front

The working class under the leadership of the Party has played a glorious role in the recent struggles. Today, under the stress of the economic crisis, the

working class is being attacked (Coimbatore, Kanpur, Bombay tram and port trust, etc.). Big battles are already taking place in Coimbatore and Kanpur.

The strike wave has gone on mounting and repression has failed to check it. Under the pressure of the economic crisis both the Government and the capitalists are desperately trying to reduce wage-costs, that is, to solve the crisis at the expense of the workers. Retrenchment, unemployment, cut in the dearness allowance and reduction in wages, attempts to prolong working hours—these constitute the means by which the National Government seeks to help the capitalists at the expense of the workers.

The recent "Industrial Truce" Conference was nothing but an open declaration of war against the working class. It shamelessly promised the capitalists that there would be no nationalisation for five years, it refused to accept the obligation for a living wage, it put profits and fair wages on the same level, making it quite clear that the capitalists were as much entitled to fair profits as the workers were to fair wages. It gave a promise of making provisions for industrial housing but in reality it only hastened to make provisions for illegalisation of strikes in the name of promoting industrial peace through arbitration.

This policy means that every effort will be made to launch an intensified offensive against working-class standards and the Government will use all its forces to crush the resistance of the working class. It also means that in future the arbitration courts and the arbitration machinery will be used more and more as weapons to put the workers at disadvantage, to deny them all their demands, take away the rights previously won, and seek every excuse to illegalise strikes.

The perspective is, therefore, one of growing deterioration of the industrial situation in which every kind of repression will be used against the workers, every kind of misrepresentation will be made and the workers will be forced to mobilise all their strength to defeat the offensive.

The trade union front, therefore, will have to bear the brunt of this offensive and defeat it with the might

of the working class. At such a time working-class rights and demands must be defended most decisively. Every care should be taken to see that the fight of the workers is not isolated from other sections of the workers and the people, whose sympathies or neutrality the National Government will try to exploit.

The National Government and the national leadership attempt to hoodwink the people by talking about national reconstruction, and in its name launch an economic offensive against the working class. They exploit the existing scarcity of goods, the high prices that the people have to pay, and make it appear that the workers' strike struggles are responsible for this so-called shortage of goods. They appeal to middle-class sentiments and ignorance by declaring that illegalisation of strikes and the measures that they are suggesting will lead to increased production and prosperity, and that the people must support them in their plans. In talking about national reconstruction, the National Government and the bourgeoisie exploit the people's desire and wish for a planned economic life and their anger against capitalist anarchy.

We must expose this bourgeois hoax of national reconstruction which is but another name for passing on the burden of the crisis to the workers and the people, through prolongation of the working day, reduction of wages, intensification of labour and mass unemployment.

We must expose that production is falling because of capitalist ownership and the crisis of capitalism, that the only way to improve it is to nationalise the means of production and remove the profit-motive from it. We should warn the people not to be a party to the reconstruction plan of the bourgeoisie which is only a profit-making plan.

We should not join in the hunt for preparing production plans, with the capitalist method of production intact and profits untouched. We should clearly show that the way of the capitalists and the Government will reduce production and not increase it. The

capitalist plan will only lead to crisis and to steep reduction in output.

We must make it clear that there can be no national reconstruction and no reorganisation of production without nationalisation of industries, without liquidating the colonial order, without implementing the programme of the democratic revolution, without giving a living wage to the workers.

Overwhelmed by bourgeois propaganda, some people are reluctant to advocate nationalisation of industries and a living wage as the basis of national reconstruction—thinking that this is too general and abstract a basis. Such elements fail to see that these are the most practical and concrete proposals and the only ones on the basis of which social order can be changed and production reorganised. Only those who are accustomed to think even of the democratic revolution as a distant perspective and do not believe in fighting for it at present, but want to argue on the basis of bourgeois practicality, will feel embarassed before our immediate programme.

Therefore, to ask the workers to produce more for the capitalist plans made for the purpose, when the working class is engaged in a bitter struggle to prevent worsening of its standard of living, is a call to sacrifice the workers to the bourgeoisie. Those who go this way are victims of bourgeois propaganda. We must expose and unmask the bourgeois plans, resist all attacks against the workers and boldly put forward nationalisation, control of profits, a living wage, etc., as our contribution to organising production. We must wage a consistent fight against the idea that nationalisation, etc., are not concrete proposals.

The trade unions and the Party will have to put up the most decisive defence of working-class interests. This will have to be done in a way in which not only the working class emerges victorious, but inspires the other classes—the middle class and the peasantry—with confidence in the common victory against the bourgeoisie. These struggles must unify the entire working class under common mass organisations and politically under the Communist Party. They will be the strongest

levers to build the new Democratic Front, the new alliance of classes which is necessary to build a democratic State based on this alliance.

Today, more than ever, when in many places the working class is drawn in different directions—some sections directed to the Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC), some sections to the Socialist Party, some confused by the stand of the National Government—it is necessary to build the unity of the working class in each struggle. This unity may be achieved before the struggle or in the course of the struggle. Every effort must be directed towards this end, for working-class unity can and shall be forged through the coming struggles against the effects of the growing economic crisis. This is so because the crisis hits every section of the working class and it is possible for us, if we adopt correct trade union tactics, to draw every section of the working class into a common front of resistance to the employers. Such united struggles afford the best lessons to the working class on the treacherous role of the reformist trade union leaders and on the need for revolutionary working-class unity.

It is also necessary to counteract the mischievous propaganda of the National Government and the bourgeoisie among the people and to win their sympathies, so that the struggles are not isolated and crushed. Today there is an overwhelming opinion in favour of strikes even in the middle class because they themselves have to go in for strikes for their own demands. This constitutes a big basis for winning popular sympathy, and how effective it can be is seen from the great fraternal demonstrations of the clerical workers of Calcutta in favour of the tramway strike.

In forging working-class unity we must make it our special task to forge the unity of the Hindu and Muslim workers to fight communalism and see that our trade unions take an active part in protecting the minorities and making the working class aware of its basic duty towards itself and the minorities. The working class must be clearly warned that its trade union struggle and the struggle for economic and political emancipation will be inevitably lost if communal

barriers are not overcome in the class itself and if the class as a whole does not fight for the democratic rights of the minorities and does not take an active part in routing those who persecute the minorities.

Afraid of our growing strength in the working class, afraid of the strike struggles and convinced that mere repression will not crush the working class, the national bourgeois leadership, headed by Sardar Patel, has launched the INTUC to disrupt the ranks of the working class, to confuse the minds of the middle class and to slander every working-class struggle. More and more the INTUC reveals itself as an appendage of the State, a labour front of the bourgeoisie in power which wants to disrupt the working-class struggles, to serve the needs of the ruling bourgeoisie.

Its role is anti-strike, anti-Communist, anti-working class. Its policy is dictated by the national leadership, i.e., the bourgeoisie, and it acts as the unofficial arm of the National Government in every strike and independent action of the working class. It is also becoming an agency through which strike-breakers and gangsters are recruited to terrorise the workers. It functions in cooperation with the police and the bosses and acts as their spy. It is being groomed to represent Indian labour in international conferences and replace the AITUC.

The following it has got in many places is due to the influence of the Congress, but it is getting discredited very quickly. Barring perhaps a few places, it has no mass following. The more it gets discredited in other places the more it bases itself on the supervisory staff, on paid hirelings, on factory officials, who compel the workers to pay subscriptions to its unions and ask the owners to victimise those who are opposed to it. The INTUC is not an ordinary reformist organisation, but one which is fast moving to become a Hitlerite labour front. The role that it played recently in the Calcutta strike and the role of intimidation of workers, of attacking them with the help of goondas, is the real role of the INTUC and it will be used more and more till the workers are able to beat it back.

The attacks of goondas, the physical assaults on

workers and the criminal intimidation practised by the INTUC are an admission of the failure of the INTUC to win over the workers and a confession of its own bankruptcy.

The role of the INTUC unions, therefore, must be thoroughly unmasked and exposed in every working-class meeting and the workers' anger must be roused against it. Every action against strike, every attempt at intimidating the workers, every act of betrayal must be unmasked so that the INTUC unions do not get any roots among the masses. Where the INTUC unions have mass influence, exposure should be combined with offers of united front on specific issues concerning wages, living conditions and offers of help in every action and struggle against the capitalists.

The Socialist Party leadership is another disruptive agency which together with the INTUC is making desperate efforts to isolate the AITUC, i.e., the vanguard of the organised working class gathered in the AITUC. It has seceded from the AITUC and has started rival unions in many places. It broke away from the AITUC after the INTUC was started and thus continued the work of disruption started by the INTUC. For fear of its ranks it dared not join the INTUC. At the same time, it had neither sufficient courage nor loyalty to the working class to remain in the AITUC and fight jointly with the Communists and others against the disruptive designs of the INTUC.

Though in some places like Bombay, under pressure from the working-class ranks, the Socialist leaders opposed the INTUC, still their general opposition to the INTUC has been a mild and polite opposition while their hostility to the AITUC is pronounced. They do not regard the Government-sponsored INTUC as their enemy but concentrate their attacks on the AITUC in which is centralised the independent strength of the trade union movement. While the Socialist leaders would never have a united front with the AITUC they join hands, as in Calcutta, with the INTUC leaders to break up the unions of the AITUC (Calcutta tramway workers' strike).

Its unions in some places have got a mass basis,

the workers being attracted to the Socialist leadership because of its Left phraseology. The Socialist leadership has attempted to stabilise this disruption by starting a new central organisation, thus splitting the ranks of the working class. The Socialist leadership itself opposes and denounces strikes organised under our leadership, supports or condones measures of governmental repression against the working class under our leadership, and itself holds back the workers under its unions as much as possible.

If the Socialist Party leadership today leads any strikes it is because of the intense pressure of the rank and file. The unions led by the Socialist Party are generally active unions in which a lot of militant material is gathered. We must make offers of united front on every occasion to these unions and workers in their struggle; we should not identify them with the policy of the Socialist leadership; and, at the same time, we should criticise the disruptive role of the Socialist leadership in the working-class movement.

Every occasion of half-hearted support to strikes or sabotaging of strikes by the Socialist leadership must be condemned by us in a way which will unify the workers and attract them to the AITUC as the common organisation. Our offer of united front should gradually develop into a demand for one central organisation and a denunciation of the disruptive move of the leadership of the Socialist Party.

By our independent actions, decisive lead of strike struggles and increase in trade union membership, we must enhance the strength of the AITUC and put it before the working class as the only class organisation consistently defending and fighting for its rights.

The National Government is making serious endeavours to take away the representative character of the AITUC and thus remove it from international gatherings. This must be fought by making the working class aware of the danger and by immensely increasing the strength of the AITUC. We have failed to carry the battle for the central organisation to the mass of workers belonging to the Socialist unions. Had

we done that, it would not have been easy for them to break away from the AITUC.

Today the AITUC has such tremendous prestige that newly formed organisations automatically turn to it for guidance and affiliation. We must realise that the strength of the AITUC is the strength of the working class, and that the stronger the central organisation is the easier it is for the working class to fight its life-and-death battle against the economic crisis and capitalist attacks.

In the course of our strike struggles, we must, along with the immediate demands, popularise the demand for nationalisation of key industries, control of profits, a living wage, as the only way out of unemployment and wage reductions.

The tendency to look on such popularisation as abstract is reformist and must be fought, and the conduct of these partial struggles must be guided by the correct Marxian understanding that no partial gains are stable in the period of crisis unless the entire capitalist offensive is defeated all round. Therefore, while accepting whatever partial victories which may give immediate relief to the workers and are acceptable to them, we will ask the workers to be always vigilant and ready for any offensive that is likely to be launched, and for their basic demands which they must achieve.

And above all, we will have no illusions that the arbitration courts appointed by bourgeois governments are likely to do justice to us. We will never have illusions that in times of economic crisis the desperate struggles between capital and labour can be solved through arbitration courts.

In defending and advancing the interests of the workers in these day-to-day struggles, we must so conduct the strikes that the working class gets unified as a class conscious of its political responsibility to struggle against the existing order and fight for a democratic State, conscious that it must lead the struggle in the democratic alliance for the people to be victorious.

Along with the fight for the defence of its day-to-day interests, the working class will champion the cause of the people as a whole, and organise mass political actions on the widest scale against repressive acts and policies of the imperialist-bourgeois-feudal combine, against workers, peasants, students, States' people and minorities. Through solidarity actions, sympathetic strikes, protest demonstrations and other forms of political action, the working class will cement the fighting alliance of the masses and increasingly come out as the defender of democratic rights and liberties, as the leader, unifier and builder of the Democratic Front.

Tasks on the Peasant Front

The central task on the peasant front is to rouse and lead the toiling peasants around the central slogan of *Land to the Tiller*. Landlordism of all forms must be liquidated without any compensation to the landlords, *khas* land of the landlords and rich peasants must be distributed amongst the toiling peasants, and all forms of feudal and semi-feudal exactions must go. The fight against eviction, against rent, against serfdom to the money-lender, for commutation of rent in kind into money, and for two-thirds share of the crop must be strengthened and developed into the fight for land to the tillers. The agricultural proletariat must be specifically organised under the All-India Kisan Sabha, either as separate organisations affiliated to it or as specially organised sections within it, for fair wages and regulation of labour conditions.

The tempo of the agrarian struggles is so sweeping and big that the Congress Ministries themselves are forced to come out with what they call anti-landlord bills. They themselves have to take up the slogan of abolition of landlordism because the bourgeoisie perceives that the peasantry can no longer be cheated except by talking about abolition of landlordism. We should not allow ourselves to be deceived by its legislations and must expose their real class character and show that the abolition of landlordism that they pro-

mise is fake and not real. In fact, today, bowing down to the opposition of the landlords, the Congress leaders and Ministries are holding the so-called anti-landlord bills in abeyance, so as to settle the question of proper compensation in the name of uniformity.

The proposed bills, in the first place, give compensation to the landlords, which we must oppose and fight. They do not take over the land monopolised by the landlords, and so do not provide for redistribution of land to the tillers. Share-croppers, tenants–at–will and other tillers, who constitute the majority of the peasant population, will not gain any right on land. The proposed bills will simply acquire with compensation only that portion of the landlords' property which has been let out on a rent-basis to tenants with occupancy rights. These measures will not abolish landlordism but retain it in a different form. Only a new load of compensation will be thrust upon the overtaxed and impoverished people for the benefit of the landlords.

For the purpose of consolidating landlordism in a new way certain Provincial Governments have produced new plans which indicate which way the wind is blowing. In these new plans (the Bengal plan, for example) it is proposed that all agricultural land in different areas will be possessed collectively by cooperatives of landlords and peasants, and the compensation money given to landlords will be invested as capital in the cooperatives. Naturally, in such so-called cooperatives, the rich landlords, owing the major share, will be in a position to control the entire land and the crops.

Before the new legislative measures are adopted, the landlords are evicting peasants from their possessions on a large scale and with the assistance of the police beating back the resistance of the evicted peasants. As a result, the private possessions of landlords are growing, monopoly holdings of land are increasing, and the tillers of the soil are being expropriated on a very large scale. The new agrarian measures will do nothing but legalise this expropriation.

To boost these measures as advances or progressive steps is to cheat the peasants and shield the bourgeois leaders.

We must expose and unmask the proposed bills as measures to rehabilitate landlordism, measures that will further impoverish the mass of tillers of the soil and thereby further intensify the food crisis. They will strengthen the hold of monopoly in food, and thereby extend the blackmarket. We must oppose compensation being given to landlords, and demand that instead of giving compensation to landlords, the State must provide for manure, irrigation, reclamation of fallow land and supply cattle, seeds and modern implements to the peasants. Land must be given to the tillers of the soil, private land belonging to landlords being expropriated without compensation. The poorer sections of landlords are to be given a moderate allowance for a certain period, or allowed to retain private land sufficient for their maintenance.

The agrarian movement against feudal relations is not complete unless land is secured for the tiller. The peasantry, in order to secure land, must develop a co-ordinated movement round that slogan—a movement emerging from the partial movements for reduction of rent, debt, etc.

We should unhesitatingly lead the fight against the food famine created by the Government's policy, and demand that the stocks of the big traders and landlords be confiscated for distributing food to the people. In the backward areas, we should demand abolition of serfdom, forced labour, illegal cesses as in the case of Warlis and Halis, and take the struggle forward to the central slogan of *Land to the Tiller*. In the States also the peasant must be roused to demand complete abolition of jagirdari and landlordism, of all feudal relations, and land to the tiller.

The economic crisis, which will smite the agrarian areas most ruthlessly, will set in motion colossal forces. These agrarian movements, uniting the entire mass of the poor peasants, middle peasants and the agrarian proletarians, will serve to bring about an alliance between the workers and the peasants which is the crux

of any successful democratic movement. They are a part of the movement for the Democratic Front against the imperialist-bourgeois combine.

To head these agrarian struggles and unify them into one single stream of agrarian resistance, centring round the slogan of *Land to the Tiller*, the All-India Kisan Sabha must be built up as the fighting central organisation of India's peasantry.

Tasks on the Student Front

In the post-war revolutionary upsurge, the student movement has played an important and significant role. The clashes between student demonstrators and the police and military in the demonstrations for the release of the INA prisoners, which roused whole cities to action, ended the wartime political lull and heralded the post-war upsurge. Mass solidarity actions of militant students during working-class strikes in the post-war period have been a new feature, raising the student movement in India to a higher level.

Although the illusion that freedom has been won gripped the students after August 15, 1947, there has been a quick revival of the student movement. The enhancement of fees (with the consequent restriction of education) has provoked angry demonstrations in many provinces. Brutal repression by the Ministries on student demonstrations against the fee-increase and in observance of political anti-imperialist anniversaries, has led to direct clashes between students and the Government, developing into a general struggle of the people for civil liberties.

With rapidly worsening economic conditions and growing political disillusionment with the Congress leadership, the perspective is one of developing struggles on the question of fees and other educational demands, solidarity action with working-class and kisan struggles, and political action on the issue of civil liberties, the democratic struggles in the States, etc.

Aware of the menace from the student movement to the rule of reaction, the Government is launching

brutal repression to "quell student revolts," to crush the spirit of the students.

Congress leaders have also started propaganda for the liquidation of the student movement as a fighting force, for the dissolution of militant student organisaions and for setting up a Government-sponsored non-political students' organisation, devoted to "constructive work."

The leadership of the Socialist Party lends support to this attack on the student movement by declaring that there is no need for a militant student movement and militant students' action. It, therefore, demands the dissolution of the militant student organisations, supports the setting-up of a common non-political organisation, and is concentrating only on recruiting students to the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party is thus ranged with those forces which seek to liquidate the student movement and disband its militant organisations.

Under such circumstances, any tendency which ignores or underestimates the importance of the student movement, its revolutionary potentialities in the struggle for real independence, democracy and Socialism, is disastrous and must be rooted out of the Party ranks. Such a tendency only plays into the hands of the liquidators of the student movement.

Similarly, any tendency which, in the name of "maintaining the unity of the student movement" and in an imaginary fear of "isolation", seeks to restrict the student movement to fighting for student demands, shirks the task of organising mass solidarity actions with working-class and kisan struggles, must also be sternly combated as a non-Marxist, anti-working–class tendency, which also would cripple the militant student movement.

The Communist students must boldly seize the initiative and, through effective leadership of the developing mass struggles and a firm ideological struggle, bring about a reorientation of the entire student movement, so that a fighting alliance of the student movement is forged with the working class and toiling masses, and the student movement as a whole comes

to accept the ideology, programme and leadership of the working class in the fight for real independence, democracy and Socialism. In this way, they must defend the militant student movement from all bourgeois attacks and rally the fighting students in a common fighting organisation.

Tasks Among the Youth

The toiling youth, drawn from the working class, the peasantry and the lower-middle class, has a special role to play in the present stage of the revolutionary struggle.

The working-class and kisan youth have always played a significant role in class battles, in the trade union and kisan struggles, and in the national movement. The lower-middle-class youth have played an important role in periods of national upsurge. In the post-war revolutionary upsurge, they have been the moving spirits in the strike-struggles of the clerks and middle-class employees. The youth from these sections have played the role of the advance-guard in the militant battles of the post-war period, in which barricades were thrown up and whole cities went into action against imperialism.

With deepening economic crisis, heightened economic exploitation of the masses, the imposition of crushing burdens on the toilers of town and country—the perspective is one of ever-larger masses of young workers, kisans and young employees and unemployed middle-class youth being thrown into the arena of struggle. Political disillusionment with the Congress leadership is spreading with utmost rapidity among the exploited, disaffected, toiling youth.

Failure to marshal the forces of youth in a powerful democratic movement under proletarian leadership, failure to take Communism directly to the toiling youth, however, is misdirecting the masses of disillusioned middle-class (and even sections of working-class and kisan youth) into reactionary communal volunteer organisations or to various youth organisations which are being developed into disruptive, anti-

democratic and anti-working-class organisations, tools in the hands of the exploiting classes.

The Communist Party must, therefore, make special efforts to win over the toiling youth to the ideology and programme of Communism, combating bourgeois, anti-working-class and anti–democratic trends among the youth. It must address itself to the task of developing a strong, democratic movement of youth toilers, for the fulfilment of the special aspirations of toiling youth in the field of labour and culture, fighting for the specific demands of the youth of the working class, the peasantry and the lower-middle class, and drawing the toiling youth into the struggle for real independence, democracy and Socialism as a powerful organised force.

Tasks on the Women's Front

Growing evidence of a new awakening amongst women and their remarkable fighting capacity and courage even in the face of the most terrible repression has been a new feature during the last few years. This has been shown by the Indian peasant and working-class women as well as the lower-middle-class women —the wives and mothers of the workers, clerks and toiling sections of the people. Linked with them, the employed women, the teacher, the nurse, the telephonist and the clerk have come forward to participate in the battles of their class, and through these have shown the tremendous fighting qualities of women. The heroic part played by the peasant women in the great struggles of Tebhaga and Telengana, the fight of the primary school teachers, small strike battles of nurses, the participation of women telephonists in the great postal strike, the firm and glorious part played by women workers (e.g., Basanti Cotton Mills, Bata, Pottery women workers of Calcutta, the textile women workers in Coimbatore, Madura and Bombay) in the long-drawn-out and fierce strike battles of recent times, and food demonstrations of lower-middle-class women are pointers to the fact that the tremendous hardships of the war years and after, the rising cost of living,

the low wages, have brought to even the most backward section of our people—the women—a new consciousness and a new fighting quality.

But the conscious efforts of the women's front during these year have remained strictly confined to the middle-class housewives, and even for this section a fighting programme for food, cloth, housing was never effectively worked out, with the result that no movement worth the name developed under the guidance and inspiration of women's organisations or the women's front.

Today, with the growing economic crisis, the threats of retrenchments and dismissals, the high prices of essential commodities, the central tasks of the women's front must be to establish close contact with, and to unify, organise and stir into action the toiling masses of women—the working class, the peasant, the employed women and the wives of workers and of the lower-middle-class employees, struggling sections of the population, whose sufferings in the coming period will continuously increase to a breaking point.

For this the entire demands of the democratic programme must be put before them and explained to them. On the one hand, the democratic rights of all workers for work, a living wage, better conditions of life, and of the peasants for land, must also be taken up by all sections of the toiling women in common with their menfolk. On the other hand, the women's fight against unjust social prejudices and oppression, their ignorance, superstition, and unequal position in society must form a powerful part of the democratic fight of mothers of all classes, to ensure a better future for their children; this will draw in women from all classes, including the middle class.

The organisational task of the women's front must be to bring increasing numbers of kisan and women workers into the kisan sabhas and trade unions, to take an increasing part in the campaigns and battles of their class. Together with that, the associations of middle-class employees like teachers, nurses, etc., where they exist, must see more active participation of women employees in the fight for their legitimate rights; and

where such organisations do not exist, they should be rapidly built up.

The peasant women constitute the dominant section of oppressed womenfolk of India; that is why there must be consistent effort to draw them into struggles of their class as well as to take up their own special demands.

The Party must pay also the greatest attention towards the mobilisation and activisation of the lower-middle-class housewives, especially, the wives of the working class, the clerks, the petty artisan, the foreman, the fitter, the small shopkeeper and the teacher. It is these toiling, hard-hit women who must be brought into the various women's organisations to implement and fight for their democratic rights. In the coming months the consciousness of these sections of women will be raised to a higher level with the oncoming and increasing strike battles of their menfolk. It will be the revolutionary task of the women's front to consolidate this new consciousness and unite the fight of all sections of women for a better and a more progressive way of life. Only thus can a real powerful and democratic women's movement be built up which will bring in half the population of the country—the women—to play a powerful and decisive role in the establishment of a People's Democratic State.

Tasks on the States' People's Front

The States, with their rotten autocratic and feudal structure and the long oppressed masses awakening to struggle, constitute the weakest link in the collapsing imperialist-feudal structure.

The lack of any democratic rights, of any democratic and parliamentary institutions, the retention of the most backward feudal privileges and relations, jagirdari, landlordism, with the feudal elements monopolising high governmental posts—all these, backed by the personal autocratic rule of the feudal Princes, make the Indian States extremely vulnerable to the popular movement.

The feudal Princes and their supporters never had any social mass basis. Their domains were bound to start shaking the moment the people woke up. Today these interests are attempting to seek a base for themselves by encouraging Hindu communalists, the RSS and other counter-revolutionary organisations, and by encouraging the massacres of Muslims to divert attention from the struggle against autocracy.

Nonetheless, the States continue to be the weakest link in the imperialist chain. The suppression of the Press, of democratic and civil liberties, the oppression of the peasants, the middle class, etc., under the autocratic rule of the Princes, and the sham reforms which do not solve a single problem unite the entire people against autocracy.

The recent agreements between the Praja Mandals and some of the Princes constitute a new attempt to stabilise old regimes with the aid of popular bourgeois leaders. But this attempt will also fail, since the new reforms cannot deceive the people for long, especially as the Praja Mandal leaders themselves have not got the same prestige as the national leaders of the Congress have in India to hold back the masses for and length of time from joining the movement to end autocracy.

The perspective on the States' people's front should not be one of winning half-way house responsible Governments based on compromise with autocracy but one of ending autocracy and carrying forward the democratic movement. The former is the reformist perspective which has led us to trail behind the present reformist Praja Mandal leaders instead of isolating them and developing decisive movements through independent initiative.

The mighty sweep of the States' people's struggles is seen in some of the biggest actions that have been launched in the recent years, like the struggle of the Kashmiri people and now of the Hyderabad people or of the Travancore people. These struggles, though conducted by reformist leaderships, develop into militant actions frightening the autocracy and making it plain that, led properly, they are invincible against the

weight of autocracy which has become unbearable for the masses.

This is borne out by the struggle in Hyderabad, where, under the leadership of the Communists and the Andhra Mahasabha, the struggle of the Telengana people has reached an unprecedently high level. Braving the terror unleashed by the Nizam's army and police and the fascist Majlis-e-Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen the people of Telengana have liberated over 2,000 villages and are conducting a bitter struggle for land, for freedom and for democracy. Thereby they have demonstrated how the struggle can grow and develop when the basic issue of land for the tiller is made an integral part of the democratic struggle, when the issue of abolition of autocracy and power for the people is placed in the forefront, when the masses are led by fighting organisations and are free from the paralysing influence of the bourgeoisie.

But in the majority of States the struggles were conducted by the reformist leaderships of Praja Mandals or the State Congress. Supported by leaders of the National Government, they used the people as pawns in the ignoble game of compromise. They restrained the people and made them look to the Central Government at whose bidding the movements were called off the moment the ground had been prepared for compromise.

The national leaders, intent on compromising within the framework of the Mountbatten Plan, only concentrated on getting the States to accede to the Indian Union, and paraded it as a big triumph. In fact, in some States, the Rulers put up a mock resistance to accession, so that the whole struggle could be developed on that issue and the people kept away from a successful struggle for democracy and for the end of autocracy.

In fact, accession, petty reforms, merger schemes, the formation of unions of States, all these are calculated to achieve the same basic objective of destroying the revolutionary movement in the States, of preserving autocracy and reinforcing it by means of an alliance with the bourgeoisie, of getting rid of the economic

barriers that prevent the full exploitation of the markets and resources of the States by the bourgeoisie in cooperation with the Princes.

Accession is not merely a device to sidetrack the attention of the people from the struggle for abolition of autocracy and agrarian reforms. It is also, as has been proved in Tehri, a weapon to protect the Princes and buttress their collapsing regimes against the democratic struggles of the people. This must be recognised and exposed.

The much-boosted scheme of merger of the States with the neighbouring Provinces protects the petty Princes against popular revolt and enables them to retain their jagirs, their income from extensive private lands and their feudal privileges. The corrupt State bureaucracy is bodily incorporated in the Provincial Administration, giving no relief whatsoever to the common people.

Where several States are grouped together to form a union, as in Kathiawar and Central India, a counter-revolutionary alliance is established against the people, and new and extensive powers are conferred on the so-called Raj Pramukhs, so as to enable them to erect effective barriers against the mounting tide of democratic struggles, and preserve the States as backwaters of reaction.

Out of all this have emerged only some reforms in which the weak bourgeois element in the States shares power with autocracy, is not even the senior partner but a junior partner. These compromises have been of such a thinly-veiled character that as soon as the mass pressure declines, there is every danger that the most reactionary elements in the States will come on top.

In fact, in many States the feudal Princes, the landlords and the jagirdars are using the RSS, the Hindu Mahasabha and the communal elements to organise intimidation and goondaism against the States' people's movements and to see that further demands for democracy are stopped.

All the Princes are organising a hunt of the Muslim minority to rouse communal passions, to give a mass

basis to the Hindu Mahasabha, to expel the Muslims into Indian territory and there create problems for the Indian Union administration. Thus those whom the National Government is allying itself with are openly organising this counter-attack against it.

The extremely weak and compromising bourgeois leadership in the States is afraid of extending the struggle to the peasants and the workers by adopting an agrarian and industrial programme. Only when the struggle lasts for some time, does it get spontaneously extended to the masses, but it is withdrawn when the masses enter the arena. This weakness is fully exploited by the States authorities to drive as petty a compromise as possible and to counter-attack the reformist struggles with communal attacks.

In these circumstances, it is essential to expose fully the agreements as sell-outs organised by the Praja Mandal leaderships in collaboration with the national bourgeois leadership.

To believe that the type of responsible government which has been ushered into the States constitutes an advance, is to ignore the revolutionary strength of the people and the character of the compromise.

It is therefore wrong not to popularise the demand for the abolition of autocracy, and to accept and be content with the reformist demand for responsible government. It is wrong to start with the programme of compromise and not even raise the demand of the abolition of autocracy.

Equally, the excuse of organisational weakness of the progressive forces must never be advanced to shield a line-up behind the compromisers, to glorify the compromise and thus win "popularity."

For, organisational weakness can never be a reason to abandon a basic slogan such as the abolition of autocracy. If in advancing such basic and correct slogans the compromisers attack us and we temporarily suffer isolation, we have to face them boldly and not retreat. The Party has grown by putting forward its programme boldly, by independently acting, and by participating in the common struggle. And it would be totally wrong to give up the right of independent criticism and

attack against those who betray the people, to give up the duty of rousing the radical sections of the States' people to independent thinking, to give up the right to educate the masses about their fundamental right to abolish feudal rule.

We must, therefore, resolutely support the movement of the States' people for liberation and democracy. While participating in the struggles launched by the reformist leadership, we should not forget our basic slogans and the fact that the people themselves are demanding an end of the feudal rule. Participating in the common struggle, fighting resolutely against compromises, and working to make the struggle all-embracing so that it reaches its basic objective—these are our tasks.

Our decisive participation in the States' people's struggles, our clear programme and sharp criticism of the compromising leadership, will rapidly rally round us the militant elements in the States' people's struggles, as the working class in many States has already rallied round us, and become a lever for building an alliance between the advance-guard and the States' people —an alliance for the achievement of complete democracy. The alliance will be defeated if the working class hesitates, does not show a militant way out of the situation and succumbs to the compromisers. Any weakness on the States' people's front will lead to the disruption of the Democratic Front.

The Untouchables

Forming the most exploited and oppressed section of our people, the six crores of untouchables are a powerful reserves in the struggle for democratic revolution. The Congress, led mainly by bourgeois leaders belonging to upper castes, has consistently refused to champion the cause of the untouchable masses and to integrate the struggle for social and economic emancipation of the untouchables with the general struggle for national freedom. This enabled the reformist and separatist leaders like Dr. Ambedkar to keep the untouchable masses away from the general democratic

movement and to foster the illusion that the lot of untouchables could be improved by reliance on imperialism.

The utter bankruptcy of this policy is proved by the fact that while the top leaders of the untouchables, like Dr. Ambedkar and Mr. Mandal, have become Ministers and thus have lined up with the ruling sections in Indian Union and Pakistan, the trusting untouchable masses continue to suffer social degradation and economic exploitation as before. As for the bourgeois leaderships of the Indian Union and Pakistan, they have done nothing for the untouchables except promising them formal equality of status.

The untouchables, therefore, have been betrayed by the Congress as well as by their own leaders. Their emancipation, it has been proved by events, can be achieved neither by reliance on imperialism nor on the bourgeoisie, but only through a united struggle of the entire toiling people against all exploitation.

In recent years the untouchables, both in cities and in villages, have waged big battles against social discrimination and against worsening conditions of life. Under the impact of the crisis the untouchable workers in Bombay, Nagpur and other centres are being drawn into the common struggle of workers and are joining the trade unions in increasing numbers. Political consciousness is fast growing among them.

To quicken this process, to draw the untouchable masses in the Democratic Front, to break down the caste prejudices of the upper-caste workers and peasants, to unite the common people of all castes against their common enemy—such are the tasks facing the Party. This task will have to be carried out by a relentless struggle against the bourgeoisie of the upper castes as well as against the opportunist and separatist leaders of the untouchables themselves. We have to expose these leaders, tear away the untouchable masses from their influence, and convince them that their interest lies in joining hands with the other exploited sections and that only the victory of the democratic revolution will emancipate them from social degradation and slavery. Every discrimination against the untouch-

ables must be denounced as a bourgeois attempt to keep the masses disunited, and every just demand of theirs must be fought for as a part of the common struggle for people's rights.

The Minorities

The Democratic Front will be repeatedly disrupted if the working class and its Party are not able to defeat the minority-baiters and solve the problem of protecting the minorities. In Indian Union Muslim minority is being hunted and attacked by Hindu communalism.

The problem of minorities is of vital importance in the class battles of the working class and the battle for a democratic State. The hunt of the Muslims is not a religious or communal hunt but an attack of the counter-revolutionary forces to disrupt the forces of the democratic revolution by involving them in an internecine war. The counter-revolutionaries realise that the common movement of the working class and the peasantry has assumed such threatening proportions that unless it is directed into fratricidal channels it cannot be defeated.

Knowing this, the working class and the Communist Party must take a firm stand against the communalists from both sides, the Hindu and Muslim communalists, fight riots and make the struggle for the rights of the minorities a part of its own struggle for political and economic emancipation. Unless the working class and its Party are able to inspire other classes with a powerful urge to protect the rights of the minorities, their right to exist, of culture, language, no discrimination in Government services, etc., and the right of religious worship as part of the democratic struggle of the entire people, the compromisers cannot be defeated and the democratic struggle cannot triumph.

The working class must, therefore, actively work for the protection of minority rights and fight against communal agencies like the Hindu Mahasabha, the Muslim League and the RSS, and also communal policies of the Congress leaders and National Government Ministers like Sardar Patel.

The War Danger

It is the design of imperialism that India and Pakistan remain in a state of permanent hostility, so that at the least sign of a revolutionary upheaval in either, both can be sidetracked into a war to drown the revolution and in the end both can be kept under complete control. Some leaders of the Central as well as Provincial Governments also indulge in warmongering in order to sidetrack the attention of the people from the struggle against their own oppressors and to divert the rising discontent of the masses into channels of hatred against Pakistan.

We must fight against this war propaganda and assert the integrity and unity of the struggles of the oppressed in both States, and pledge to help each other by maintaining friendly relations and carrying on the fight against our oppressors and exploiters, and by fighting the common enemy, British imperialism.

Unless great vigilance is exercised by the working class and its Party, they may find themselves dragged behind the bourgeoisie in the imperialist game of war between the two States. Today, threats of war, etc., are no doubt part of pressure politics and are meant to key up popular support behind the Governments. But, at the same time, real issues of conflict, like that of Kashmir, are arising. These issues, manipulated by imperialism, may any day lead to what may virtually amount to war.

The working class must take a clear attitude on this question. The fight over the States bordering on the two Dominions has become a question of pure grabbing of territory without any progressive content on either side. The working class on either side cannot support this lust for territory—of both Dominions—neither of whom genuinely accepts either the right of self-determination or the freedom of the peasants and the people from feudal rule.

In the event of a conflict arising on this or any other issue, the working class and the people must assert the unity of the democratic movements on both sides and declare that the interests of the working class

and the common man lie in fighting imperialism and their common oppressors, the landlords and the capitalists, and not in fighting each other at their dictates. The latter course would only perpetuate imperialist-feudal-bourgeois bondage. In fact, the conflict will be engineered precisely to defeat the common democratic movement in both territories.

The conspiracy of the communalists from both sides will lead to more and more riots, since they are required by the counter-revolutionaries to stop the march of the people. In every province, in every town, riots will have to be fought ruthlessly by forging the common bond and exposing the common enemies. The common bond forged in the class struggles, in the working-class and kisan struggles, in the trade unions and kisan sabhas, will become stronger and stronger the more the Party succeeds in leading the partial battles and showing the solidarity of the oppressed.

Fight For Self-Determination

The Congress leadership by its compromising policy and its hostility to the right of self-determination has brought about a disastrous partition of the country. Today, in the Indian Union, it is again committing the same crime, in the interests of the dominating bourgeoisie, by refusing self-determination to national units like Maharashtra, Kerala, Tamilnad, etc.

Such a refusal is bound to lead to hostile sentiments among the different nationalities of the Indian Union and create the danger of exploitation of their discontent by reactionary elements. In the interests of advancing the democratic movement, the Party must support the right of all nationalities to self-determination and demand that it be made a part of the Constitution. Unless the Party takes a lead in this, the communal reactionaries are likely to run away with it.

Foreign Policy

The Indian bourgeoisie, allied to imperialism for crushing the Indian revolution, eager to secure economic

and military assistance from U.S. and British imperialism, anxious to enter the markets of the Indian Ocean region by the grace of Anglo-American imperialists, is emerging increasingly as a party to imperialist plans for crushing the revolution in these countries.

In view of the strong sympathies of the Indian masses with the camp of democracy and Socialism, with the cause of Indonesia and Viet Nam, the Congress leadership hides its subservience to the Anglo-American bloc in world politics under the cover of 'neutrality' between opposing camps, of frank opportunism to realise Indian bourgeois interests.

The Communist Party must boldly declare that there can be no neutrality in the world struggle between the forces of imperialism and the forces of democracy, independence and Socialism—any more than there can be such neutrality in the struggle of the exploiters and the exploited inside India.

Recognising the strong popular feelings against imperialism, the Party must ruthlessly unmask every betrayal by the Indian Government in the field of foreign policy. It must seek every opportunity to mobilise popular masses in support of the democratic cause in every country.

It must combat the poisonous anti-Soviet propaganda that is disseminated by bourgeois politicians and also by the Socialist leaders, and popularise the role of the Soviet Union as the leader of humanity in the struggle for independence, democracy, Socialism and a lasting peace.

It must popularise the glorious achievements of the Chinese Revolution, underlining its international significance—particularly its significance for the peoples of Asia.

It must make special efforts to frustrate the political and military measures of imperialism to crush the revolutions in Indonesia and Viet Nam, by means of ceaseless propaganda and mass solidarity actions.

It must conduct a merciless campaign of exposure against the plans being hatched for a South-East-Asia "Defence Bloc" under the leadership of the British,

French and Dutch imperialists, with India playing a principal role, which is designed to be the finishing touch to imperialist plans for the reconquest of this region.

Lead the Masses

Disillusionment against the policies of the national leadership is rapidly growing among the people. These policies will not solve a single problem of the people. There is no scope for industrial development of India on capitalist lines—beyond the colonial order and status. These policies will add to the misery and impoverishment of the Indian masses.

Struggles—partial, economic and political—against this impoverishment have a profound revolutionary meaning in the context of the maturing of the democratic movement in our country. The Party must work its utmost to win the maximum possible public support for every one of these struggles, with the knowledge that with the worsening crisis affecting every section of the common people, it will be possible to nail down the vested interests as the chief enemy of our economic life.

The imperialists and their agents seek to build a line-up from the British and American imperialists to the bourgeoisie, in order to stop the tide of the revolution. They hope that the bourgeoisie will succeed in splitting the popular forces, paralysing large sections of the masses and repressing the rest. Their own agents have already started this process through riots.

At this stage the fate of the democratic movement depends on the correct policy of the Communist Party and of the working class—a policy which must see the great strength of the forces of democracy and also their weakness in the illusions that the masses have about the bourgeoisie. To gather that strength through the Democratic Front, to dispel the illusions by unmasking the collaborators, and to carry forward the fight on the basis of the programme of the democratic movement—these are the special tasks of the Party of the working class.

The Communist Party, by exposing the national bourgeois leadership will accelerate the process of disillusionment of thousands, enabling the Democratic Front to grow and develop sufficient strength to defeat the bourgeois policies and create the pre-conditions for the establishment of a democratic State, which will really be an instrument for implementing the full programme of the democratic movement and for simultaneously passing on to Socialist construction, without an intermediary stage of capitalism.

In the present period of world crisis the task of pushing the democratic movement ahead is the responsibility of the working class and its party, the Communist Party. The independent role and activity of the working class, as the champion of the anti-imperialist masses against the imperialist-feudal combine and against the collaborationist bourgeoisie, constitute the guarantee for the success of the democratic movement.

The working class cannot play this role unless it itself is growingly united under its vanguard, the Communist Party, and unless the Party is able to unite the people in the Democratic Front, and activise broad masses in the cause of achieving real People's Democracy.

It is, therefore, more than ever necessary to broaden the mass base of the Party among workers, peasants, middle class, students, youths of all sections, women, and the oppressed minorities, so that the Party of the working class becomes a real mass party capable of discharging the great responsibilities resting on its shoulders.

It is necessary to attract fighters from all fronts and all sections, militants from partial struggles and all honest revolutionaries to the ranks of the Party, to educate them in Marxism-Leninism, so that they in their turn become the real educators of the masses, guiding and leading them towards complete freedom, democracy and Socialism.

Particular emphasis must be placed on recruiting militants from the working class into the Party and on educating and promoting to responsible positions of

leadership the rising worker cadres in the Party, thus strengthening the proletarian element in our Party, in our leadership; it must be clearly understood that only a conscious effort in this direction, particularly in educating such cadres in the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, and in their application to the problems of the Indian revolution can ensure the development of a strong disciplined mass Communist Party. Towards a mass Communist Party with a conscious membership, fully trained in Marxism-Leninism—such must be our watchword.

Other CPI Publications

MARSHALL PLAN FOR ASIA!

Prosperity Or Pauperisation? **As. 3**

A timely exposure of the American "plans" for India.

WHY NO NATIONALISATION?

By B. T. Ranadive **As. 3**

An examination of Nehru Govt's industrial policy.

OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMEN

&

WAR AGAINST TOILERS

By B. T. Ranadive **As. 3 each**

Statements by the General Secretary of the Communist Party on the repression let loose by the Government.

POLICE RAJ

By S. A. Dange **As. 2**

Speech in the Bombay Assembly, indicting the Government for its dictatorial legislations.

TOWARDS THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

Statement of Policy **As. 2**

FOR A FIGHTING FRONT OF TOILING MILLIONS

Review of the 2nd Congress **As. 4**

CONSTITUTION OF THE CPI

Adopted at the 2nd Congress **As. 2**

*** postage extra ***

available at

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD.,
190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.
and all its branches